STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
main,stks
944C957
Review, historical and politic
0 0001 00331993 4

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2020 with funding from
[illegible] Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the [illegible] Department of Education [illegible] Library

REVIEW,

HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL,

OF THE LATE

REVOLUTION IN FRANCE,

AND OF

THE CONSEQUENT EVENTS IN

BELGIUM, POLAND, GREAT BRITAIN,

AND OTHER PARTS OF

EUROPE.

BY CALEB CUSHING.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

BOSTON:
CARTER, HENDEE & CO.
NEWBURYPORT:
THOMAS B. WHITE.

1833.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1833,
BY CARTER, HENDEE & CO.
In the Clerk's Office of the District of Massachusetts.

PRINTED AT THE HERALD OFFICE,
Newburyport.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THERE is a dramatic unity, as well as deep interest, in the French Revolution of the Three Days, and the consequent events, which transpired in other parts of Europe. Much has been published concerning them in detached parts; but no continuous narrative of the whole, upon a uniform plan, adapted to the popular use and apprehension. Especially is there an absence of such a narrative, and such a form, drawn up with reference to the wants of the general reader in the United States. These considerations suggested the present publication.

It is difficult, I am aware, to write cotemporaneous history well, — that is, impartially as to men, and faithfully as to the inducements and causes of events. But what then? Shall we not understand or inquire what is passing around us in the existing world? Shall we busy ourselves only in the annals of past ages? Imperfectly as we may write or ascertain the history of our own time, surely it is desirable to acquire such degree of information touching it, as we may; for we cannot avoid gaining a loose knowledge of facts from the daily perusal of newspapers and the customary intercourse of society, even if we abstain from making or reading books; and it would seem to be wise and proper to correct our opinions, and fix our ideas of events and of the actors in them, by the surest approximation to correct history, which it is in our power to effect.

While duly sensible, therefore, of the defects inseparable from such a work as the present, I claim for it at least a good purpose. And although I cannot pretend to absolute impartiality, — although it were vain to deny the bias in favor of liberal principles, which belongs to my social position and my nationality, — yet thus much I will say, that I have endea-

35978

vored to state facts truly as they are presented to us in the printed records of the period. It is for the reader to judge whether those facts warrant and justify the reflections, which I have freely introduced into my narrative, as opportunity invited.

Occasional reference will be found, in the text or notes, to such authors, as have afforded me valuable aid. Something I may have derived from personal knowledge of men and things in Europe. In writing cotemporaneous history, especially at the present day, exact citation of specific authorities for each fact is hardly practicable. A vast number of journals, of every description, furnish intelligence, not always to be trusted implicitly, but yet frequently of the most authentic quality, as in the case of legislative debates, public documents, letters of responsible individuals, and the like. Pamphlets and reviews, if they do not greatly increase the amount of original information, serve to analyze, correct, and explain that, which is obtained from other sources. It is, in fact, the current historical and political knowledge of the day, which I have endeavored to seize and embody in the most unpretending form, after attentive perusal of the state-papers, imperfect histories, and periodical publications, which bear upon my subject.

It is proper to add that a portion of the work was originally written for and published in the American Annual Register.

INTRODUCTION.

CONTENTS.

SECTION I.

RETROSPECT OF EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION.

Page.

Plan.—Elements of European Institutions.—Their Diversity and their Conflict.—The Barbarians.—The Romans.—The Church.—Legitimacy.—The Barbarous Age.—Feudalism.—The Commons.—The Church.—Epochs of European Civilization.—The Crusades.—Royalty.—The Italian Republics.—Other Municipalities.—Parliaments, Cortes, and States.—Centralization of Social Elements.—Attempts at Church Reform.—Literature.—Discoveries and Inventions.—The Reformation.—Its Theory.—Character of the Age.—English Revolution.—France. - - - - - ix

SECTION II.

IDEA OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

Means of Knowledge and Opinion.—Political Organization of France before the Revolution.—Social Condition.—Reign of Louis XVI.—Court and Cabinet.—American War.—Financial Embarrassments.—Assembly of Notables.—States General.—Neckar.—Mirabeau.—La Fayette.—Duke of Orleans.—Constitutional Monarchy.—Legislative Assembly.—National Convention.—The French Republic.—Robespierre.—The Reign of Terror.—The Directory.—Napoleon Bonaparte.—The Empire.—Restoration of the Bourbons.—The Hundred Days.—Reign of Louis XVIII.—Charles X.—Recapitulation. - - - - - - lv

INTRODUCTION.

SECTION I.

Plan.—Elements of European Institutions.—Their Diversity and their Conflict.—The Barbarians.—The Romans.—The Church.—Legitimacy.—The Barbarous Age.—Feudalism.—The Commons.—The Church.—Epochs of European Civilization.—The Crusades.—Royalty.—The Italian Republics.—Other Municipalities.—Parliaments, Cortes, and States.—Centralization of Social Elements.—Attempts at Church Reform.—Literature.—Discoveries and Inventions.—The Reformation.—Its Theory.—Character of the Age.—English Revolution.—France.

In deliberately reviewing the French Revolution of the Three Days of July, and the consequent events in Europe, it is natural to seek for the remote as well as the immediate causes of the political changes, which signalize the present epoch of European history. The immediate causes belong to, and are mixed up with, the events themselves: — the remote or predisposing causes exact a wider range of observation. For those changes are not to be regarded as insulated facts, detached from past or passing events, and independent of the great system of the European Republic. On the contrary, they form the parts of a visible whole, they are the catastrophe, the *dénouement* of the great social drama,

of which all Christendom is the scene. They are connected together by a pervading common principle, and they succeed the incidents of other ages, not merely in sequence of time, but as determinate effects following upon efficient causes. Retracing our steps backward, we come, in the first place, it is plain, to the incidents, policy, and opinions of the Restoration, which substituted the constitutional sceptre of the recalled Bourbons for the revolutionary truncheon of Napoleon. But we cannot scrutinize and ponder this period, so as to arrive at satisfactory results, without understanding the philosophy of the first Revolution, its origin and its progress. And having advanced thus far, we shall perceive that the entire series of events, from the Assembly of Notables in 1787 down to the Barricades of 1830, appertains to the comprehensive subject of modern civilization and social improvement, — although it be on the surface of things a question of French politics, attaching simply to the history of France.

These remarks open to us the course of inquiry, which alone is competent to give a clear and full idea of the inner workings of political change in Europe, and especially the Revolution of the Three Days. To understand this, we must consider, — 1. The elements, the composition, the successive changes, the general action, of the political system of Christendom; 2. The French Revolution, including, of course, the Restoration, out of whose misfortunes and crimes the Revolution of July was destined to spring.

It is an obvious peculiarity of the social institutions of modern Europe, that they have been founded on the ruins of a preexisting state of civilization. Like so many edifices of Italy or Greece at the present day, their materials have not been quarried out of the living rock, but collected from the scattered remains of the temples and dwellings of ancient times. In the face of society, as in our languages, we do not see an original idea, principle, or form, receiving its developement from the impulse of circumstances, and grow-

ing up from the simple beginnings of primitive life into the large and comprehensive system of advanced civilization; but the ideas, principles, and forms of a past age and an extinct people, recombined and modified according to the tastes and exigences of the succeeding age and of a new people. Hence, in the investigation of the theory of the social institutions under which we live, we possess a fixed point of departure, a definite starting-place: we know that in the crumbling frame of the Roman Empire, and in the fusion of the invading Barbarians with the conquered inhabitants of Italy, Gaul, Spain, Britain, we are to seek for the elements of modern European civilization.

Carry back the mind, then, to that disastrous epoch of our history, when rapine and violence ruled the world; when all the component parts of society seemed to be resolved into chaotic confusion; when cities wasted by fire and sword, nations swept into oblivion, the accumulated fruits of ages of refinement and wealth annihilated in a day, bore witness to the fury of human passions, when loosed from the control of reason and religion, and given up to the dominion of selfishness and rapacity. Out of that scene of tremendous disorder, that shock of classes, races, and opinions, arose the combinations of modern society; and it was that very collision itself, which impressed upon European society its characteristic features.

If we look at the subsisting institutions of Asia, — institutions which have endured from beyond the period of authentic records, — we find that a comprehensive unity of principle is the secret at once of their stability and of their total absence of progression. They do not recede: — they do not advance. The theocratic principle swallowed up all others, and stamped a fixed and monotonous character upon their manners, their literature, their monuments, their opinions. Thus it was, also, in ancient Egypt. — Again, if we examine the civilization of the Greeks, we do not find their institutions congealed as it were into one unchanging form;

with them, there was progression, developement, melioration; their principle of civilization was an advancing one, namely, the democratic principle, and the rapidity of its advancement was as extraordinary as the magnificent results it produced; but the other great elements of civilization were overpowered or borne away in its progress, and it was left standing alone and unsupported, to sink into premature exhaustion. In a word, the civilization of the Chinese, the Hindus, the Egyptians, the Greeks, the Romans, the Arabs, has wanted either the capacity of progression or the capacity of sustaining and reproducing itself by new combinations.

In modern Europe, on the contrary, no one principle has acquired such fixed ascendancy over all others, as either to arrest the march of civilization, or to suffer it to decay from the deficiency of renovated forces; the various elements of social organization have held on their progress side by side; the spiritual and temporal powers, the different principles of government, the various degrees of social condition, have all existed together, — contending with, limiting, running into, and balancing one another, — and each acquiring vigor and developement from perpetual action. This incessant movement of European society, always in activity, and amid occasional checks and vicissitudes, yet on the whole continually advancing, is the distinctive property, which it derives from the combination of the opinions and social forms of the northern Barbarians with those which previously existed among the Romans.

The Barbarians brought with them two principles, which gave to them victory and power for the time being, and which impelled European society into a new channel of exertion. — The first was the passion of individual independence. The kindred sentiment, which appears in the face of Greek and Roman society, is political liberty, the freedom of a citizen, of a member of a political association; but this was widely different from the sentiment of personal independence, which distinguished the Norman and Ger-

man tribes, and still exists in all its intensity among our own North American Indians. They were children of the woods, and the creatures of individual impulse, who joined in political society, not for the purpose of exchanging the freedom of national independence for the freedom of legal citizenship, but solely in order to secure the possession and enjoyment of that cherished faculty of uncontrolled volition. — The other principle, introduced by them, was the institution of military patronage, the attachment of each individual, — not to a community, to an aggregate body of men, or to a sovereign as representing the national will, — but to another individual, as an individual, by means of which the parties gained the advantages of combined force without assuming any general obligations to society, or entirely sacrificing the principle of individual independence.

From among the political institutions of the Empire, there survived two things, also, which have exercised a marked influence upon modern civilization. One was, the municipal organization, as it existed in the great cities of the Empire. Rome itself was, in the beginning, only a muncipality; the Greek and Italian republics, in general, were nothing but cities, and confederations of cities; and as Rome proceeded in the march of aggrandisement, it was by the conquest and foundation of cities that she established her authority through Europe. The earth was tilled, not by proprietors scattered over its whole extent, or grouped around castles in manors and farm-houses, but either by free cultivators belonging to and residing in the towns, or else by slaves. The military organization of the Republic and the Empire held together for awhile so many cities originally independent; and when the Empire fell in pieces by the vice of its composition and the violence of the Barbarians, the municipalities remained, and the municipal system withstood the shock, which swept away all the other institutions of the Empire. — But although this institution alone remain-

ed, yet the idea, the principle, of another, still subsisted, and that was the idea of power and authority attached to the name of Emperor and the civil legislation of the Empire.

Finally, in addition to these elements, out of which to recompose the social fabric of Europe, we have the Christian Church; that is, not Christianity merely, the body of religious faith as such, but the Christian Church as a public institution. In the earlier periods of ecclesiastical history, we discern the foundations of a church-government, in the presbyters, bishops, and deacons, who discharged certain public functions or duties in the bosom of the Church, without being separated into a distinct or authoritative class, Which of these may have been prior in point of time, or superior in station, it is not relevant to our present purpose to enquire; suffice it to say that, at the period when the Barbarians overran the Empire, there was an established hierarchy with set rules of religious government, — a body of clergy separated from the people, having its revenues, jurisdiction, and peculiar constitution; — there was, in short, a visible Christian Church. This had the most important effects upon the new civilization, the foundations of which were then laid. In the first place, the Church, by its organization, proved the efficient means, under Providence, of sustaining the religion itself against the torrent of ignorance, violence, and paganism, which flowed in upon the Empire in the train of the Barbarians. In the second place, the clergy stood ready to perform the duties of the municipal magistracy, in that time of disaster, when laymen shrank from its cares and responsibilities. Thirdly, they alone were the depositories or advocates of the moral force of the community, they alone exerted the influence of opinions, of principles, of high responsibility, to mitigate or withstand the fury of mere brute force, which was overwhelming the Roman world. Finally, the Church, content, at that time, to govern the conscience, and disclaiming the pursuit of worldly power, was itself the first to introduce the principle

of separating temporal and spiritual concerns, the principle of liberty of conscience, in order to abstract itself from the grasp of the Barbarians.

Here, then, amid these different forms of socicty, the Barbarian, the Roman, and the Christian, each with its peculiar laws, — amid the conflicting principles of hostile races of men, each with its peculiar language, manners, and ideas, — we are to find the origin of the forms of government now existing in Europe, the primitive stock, the root, from which in the lapse of time each has sprung. Which of these forms, then, has claims to be considered the true original type of government, — which of them is entitled to the name of *legitimate?*

There is one school of publicists, which maintains that the conquering race was possessed of all powers, all rights; that this race is the *noblesse;* and that whatever power kings and peoples may hold has been plundered from the hereditary aristocracy, the only legitimate rulers of modern Europe. Another sustains the cause of royalty, alleging that the German kings inherited all the rights of the Roman emperors, and are alone legitimate. Another school points to the assemblies of the freemen, that is, the great mass of the people, exercising the powers of legislation and sovereignty, and attributes the older and better right to the republican or democratic principle. Finally, in face of all these plausible pretensions, comes the Church, and claims to be the legitimate authority by virtue of its divine mission, not less than its agency in restoring or preserving the civilization of Europe.

It is evident that each of these classes of opinions is right and each is wrong; for they are all legitimate, but neither of them exclusively so. In our own times, there is an affectation, current among the adherents of absolute power in the person of hereditary princes, of applying to their authority the epithet of legitimacy, as if kings alone were legitimate. The assumption is totally unfounded in fact.

If monarchy be legitimately derived from the Cæsars, or Clovis, or Charlemagne, so also aristocracy has a legitimate foundation in the feudal system, and republicanism in the free towns of Flanders and Germany and the republics of Italy. For in the period between the fifth and tenth centuries there is no predominant form of government; there is nothing stable, fixed, or determinate; there is a universal intermingling and confusion of the social elements; and this is the peculiar character of the age of the Barbarians.

Looking at the condition of persons, we perceive freemen and liegemen, slaves and freedmen, not separated into fixed classes, but continually interchanging condition, — freemen assuming the obligations of vassalage, liegemen becoming freemen, liegemen and freemen both reduced to servitude, and the slave acquiring enfranchisement. Royalty exists, but without precise authority, or determinate claims, and made up of mixed election and inheritance; popular assemblies exist, but they, who should attend them, neglect to do it; and an aristocracy exists, but neither its power nor its station is clearly defined. There are no fixed boundaries to states, no settled governments, no nationality of institutions; but an utter confusion of races, tongues, laws, rights, and social principles. Of course 'legitimacy', which is the watchword of anti-reformers at the present time, is a pretension just as unfounded as the cabala of 'divine right', which *our* forefathers, the hardy commonwealthsmen, refused to revere.

This condition of universal disorder lasted so long, first, because the invasion did not terminate with the conquest of Gaul, Italy, and Spain, but was continued by the pressure of new tribes of barbarians from the North, and by the approach of the Arabs from the South, who conspired to keep up a ceaseless movement in the intermediate countries; and secondly, by the operation of the principle of personal independence characteristic of the ancient Germans, which tended to counteract the cohesion of the social

elements. But such a state of things could not endure. Men began to aspire after improvement, order, civilization; the memory of the Empire, and the image of its grandeur and power, were present to their minds; the Church impelled them into the path of melioration; those mighty geniuses, those men of great energies and lofty purposes, by whom the world is pushed along, sprang up in the very bosom of barbarism, to work out the advancement of their fellow-men. Hence the multitude of legal codes among the tribes of France and Germany. Hence the revival of the Italian municipalities under the Ostrogoths. Hence the ecclesiastical legislation of the Spanish Visigoths. Hence the grand efforts of Charlemagne and Alfred. All these were imperfect attempts to put an end to the reign of confusion, to establish a regular and stable society; and in fact, when we arrive at the tenth century, we begin to stand upon solid ground. The great movement of the Barbarians was then at an end; and men gradually acquired local attachments, the sentiment of stability and fixedness; and the feudal system finally took possession of Europe.

The primary stage, therefore, in the progress of modern civilization was the establishment of the feudal system, the public institutions, as might have been expected, receiving their first great organization from the two elementary principles introduced by the Barbarians. Every thing, at this period, assumed the form of feudality. Kings became suzerains: the towns and churches had their lords and their vassals. Not only lands, but incorporeal rights growing out of them, and even the casual revenues of the clergy, such as the fees of baptism, came to be granted in fief. The Church, however, the municipalities, the kings, in wearing the livery of feudality, did not lose their own distinctive nature: it is only among the lay barons that the aristocratic forms of the feudal system found a congenial spirit. Its prevalence, however, became so universal, and its immediate effects were so singular, that cotemporary

observers, who beheld mankind grouping themselves into the little isolated associations of lord and liegemen, looked upon that as the final dissolution of society, which in truth was the first stage in a systematic reconstruction of it.

Previously, it will be remembered, men lived collectively, either stationed in towns and cities under the influence of Roman institutions, or assembled in the wandering and predatory bands of the Barbarians. By the operation of the feudal system this state of things was reversed. The population, as among the Germans, became scattered over the country in isolated habitations; and the government of society passed from the cities to the country. The lord established his residence in some elevated spot, capable of defence, where he constructed his baronial castle, and took up his abode with his wife, his children, and his domestics. Around the base of his stronghold were grouped the dwellings of his feudal vassals, and of the tenants or serfs, who cultivated the soil. In the midst of their habitations rose the village church. And thus, in the baron with his castle, in the vassals and cultivators gathered under its wing, and in the village church with its priest, we have the original form of a purely feudal society. In order to appreciate the influence of this institution upon the civilization of Europe, let us consider it under its different aspects, as well within each separate society, as in the relations of each to others of the same description.

First, as to the interior of the baronial castle. The baron is in the full enjoyment of that sentiment of personal independence, which the Barbarians held so dear. His rights, his power, are his own exclusively and individually; his consequence does not depend upon his relation to other men, like that of a Roman senator, but is inherent in his person as the possessor of his fief, and the lord of his vassal. Hence the developement, among the feudal barons, of a spirit of power allied to cruelty, of pride degenerating into harshness, of self-reliance and contempt of danger prone to acts of violence,

of independence impatient of the bonds of law, — the characteristic features of the feudal age and the moral effects of the feudal system. Again, the baron lives apart from the world. His occupations are war and the chase. The circle of his pursuits and pleasures, in time of peace, is peculiarly limited. He is one of a small society, — his own family, — who are above, or foreign to, all around them, and who are habitually driven back upon themselves for happiness. Hence the growth, in modern times, of that spirit of domesticity, which was unknown to the ancients, who lived abroad, in the forum or elsewhere, and whose dwellings, as we see them in restored Pompeii, were totally destitute of the most ordinary conveniences of domestic life. Hence, also, a much more powerful developement of the spirit of hereditary succession and of the love of family than in other forms of social institutions. Hence, also, in part, the dignity and influence of the female sex in modern times, produced by the combined influence of the Christian religion, which has taught the equality of the sexes,—and of the feudal system, which, through the isolation of families, rendered man more dependant upon woman, and less upon exterior society, for that fellowship of taste, feelings, and opinions, so indispensable to the enjoyment of human existence.

Secondly, as to the cultivators of the soil. Certain it is that, in all parts of Europe, a mutual attachment grew up between the members of the baronial family and the vassals on the barony; for each had the power of performing good offices for the other; and the services of the vassals, and the bounty and protection of the lord, could not fail to exert a favorable influence on the mind of each party. At the same time, the dependance of the vassal and serf was so unnatural, the power of the lord was so despotic, and so liable to abuse, that the system could not fail to be eminently odious to the cultivators of the soil, far more so than any other form of absolute government. The Scottish clansmen are the kinsmen of the chief, bearing his name, and hav-

ing numerous other points in common with him; an Arab sheikh, and the tribe he governs, live together in the simplicity of pastoral life and of patriarchal relations; but the connexion of the feudal lord and of the vassals at the foot of the castle is in its nature essentially repulsive, having scarcely any properties fitted to reconcile the cultivator to the galling chains he wears. Hence the extreme aversion of the European peasantry to this form of authority, and their perpetual efforts to shake it off, at various periods in the history of Europe.

Finally, as to the relation of the possessor of a benefice with other fief-holders, or with his suzerain. It is perfectly well known that the mutual obligations of the parties, originally founded on and defined by considerations of an honorary nature, came at length to form a complicated code, detailing the duties to be performed by the respective parties to the obligation. In a word, a prescribed organization, military, deliberative and judicial, was communicated to the feudal system. It was, however, to fief-holders only, not to the cultivators, the population of the fiefs, that the system attached.

Now the marked peculiarity of the institution was the absence of political guaranties, of a controlling power, by means of which individual wills and forces might be made to observe a common rule of conduct. In the institutions, of which we have experience, there is either some one will so far superior to all others as to be able to exact obedience at pleasure, or there is a public will, an aggregate of the wills of a community, which possesses the same power; there is the public security, either of the despotism of one man or body of men, or there is a free government acting through its appointed agents. But neither of these conditions intervened in the feudal system. Undoubtedly there was the suzerain, and there were great inequalities in the power of different barons; so that, one might think, the means of enforcing obedience were at hand. But the suzerain, after all, was only a baron more wealthy than the rest, destitute

of any permanent centralization of government, dependant upon special and occasional resources for all his strength, and liable to see his authority continually set at naught by individual barons or coalitions of barons, fortified in their feudal fastnesses. On the other hand, no popular voice, no public authority representing a general public will, offered itself for the control of individuals. Each baron saw himself equal in right with the rest, holding his power as a personal quality inherent in his fief, not derived from any legal will of a community, nor owing to it any accountability. So far as any concurrence of will and action had place among them, it was by means of the partial use of a federal system, — the most complicated of the forms of government, — that which belongs peculiarly to a state of high civilization, of general intelligence, of the habit of legal action, — and which was least of all capable of assuring peace and order in a barbarous age. Of course, the characteristics of this period, the tenth and eleventh centuries, are the independent spirit of the barons, their frequent practice of private war upon each other as well as upon their common head, their proneness to the unlicensed gratification of revenge and selfishness, and the general prevalence of outrage and bloodshed : — the reign of force, as distinguished from the reign of law.

Taking all these facts into consideration, we see that the influence of feudalism upon the individual was good, its influence upon the public, bad. Noble sentiments, lofty characters, exaltation of aim, generosity, honor, courage, fidelity to engagements, — all these are prominent traits of the feudal age. Chivalry, with so many splendid aspirations, flourished in its bosom. The baronial castle, the seat of the domestic pleasures and affections, was also the cradle of the poetry, music, fiction, — and, in common with the convents, of the intellectual tastes in general, — where they first began to be relished in modern Europe. At the same time, the feudal system was radically hostile to the authority of princes on the one hand, and to the liberties of the

people on the other ; it stood in the way of order and of freedom alike ; and it was only by the coalition of the kings and people that it was first disarmed, and then overthrown.

Having traced the developement of the feudal system, the characteristic institution of the Barbarians, let us now advert to the municipal principle, saved from the wreck of the Roman institutions. Suppose a townsman of the feudal age to have risen to life in 1789, at the opening of the French Revolution, and to have heard the definition of his own rank and class in life given by Sieyes. '*Le tiers-état, c'est la nation française, moins la noblesse et la clergé.*' In the first place, he would not understand what was meant by '*la nation française ;*' in the second place, if the words were explained to him, the proposition would seem incredible, monstrous: — it would communicate the idea of no state of things of which he had practical knowledge. He would have no conception of such a degree of power held or claimed by the *bourgeoisie*. Carry him into the interior of one of the great towns of France, on the other hand, and when he saw it without fortifications, without a civic force, subject to taxation imposed and to municipal magistrates appointed from without, he would be as much astonished, in view of the dependance and feebleness of the burghers, as he had previously been at the idea of their partaking of the national sovereignty. Now to comprehend the situation of things in the feudal age, we have to reverse the picture. In reference to the general affairs of the country, its government, its political organization, the burghers were nothing : — they were not mentioned or thought of in that connexion. But enter within a town, and you would find yourself in a citadel defended by armed men, taxing themselves, electing their own magistrates, making war on their own account.

Rome, as we have already remarked, was properly speaking a municipality ; and it was over municipalities like itself, exercising all the powers of sovereignty, political as well as municipal, that the Roman Empire was extended. The

rights of peace and war, of legislation, and of taxation, were of course taken from them, to be concentrated in Rome, leaving to them nothing but the powers of municipal administration; and in this state they were found by the Barbarians. In the chaos of the invasion, their condition, of course, was precarious, uncertain, shifting, like every thing around them: — it became settled to a certain point, only with the establishment of the feudal system, into which they of necessity entered, each as part of a fief held by some one of the conquerors. Here began a series of aggressions, of acts of extortion or oppression on the part of the lord, tempted by the valuable products of the industry and skill of the burghers; and a series of struggles on the part of the towns to escape from the arbitrary power of their immediate feudal superiors. These mutual injuries finally brought on, in the eleventh century, a general state of warfare between the *communes* and the barons; not organized warfare of the order of barons as a body against the order of burghers as a body, but separate independent contests, oftentimes of long duration, between a single baron and a town within his fief; and such separate contests going on as it were contemporaneously in all parts of Europe.

It will be recollected that the principle of individuality, of personal independence, was characteristic of the era. The burghers saw the barons around them warring against one another, and against their suzerain, at will, and sustaining their real or fancied rights by the armed hand; and they caught the spirit of resistance from the examples of reliance upon individual energies, which everywhere met their eyes. The burghers fortified their towns; they enrolled themselves in a civic militia; they constructed their *beffroi*, with its watch tower and its bell to summon them to arms. Each man's dwelling, being built like a tower and flanked at the angles with turrets, was a genuine fortress. The course of things was regular enough in its irregularity. On occasion of some act of extortion practised by the agents of the

lord, they were slain or expelled by the burghers, who thereupon marched against his baronial castle in the neighborhood. If they prevailed, they compelled him to make conditions for their relief: — if they failed, he attacked them in return, demolished their fortifications, and made their insurrection the excuse for new exactions. Frequently one party or the other appealed to the mediation of other lords or of their common suzerain; and thus a community of interest began to grow up between the kings and the towns. The conventions concluded by the parties, — their treaties of peace, — were the charters, stipulating for the enfranchisement, total or partial, of the towns, upon the conditions and with the reservations therein prescribed. In the twelfth century, the contest was in a great measure at an end, and the rights of the commons had come to be fixed and acknowledged. The *tiers-état*, the *bourgeoisie*, the people, had acquired weight and place in the social system, not exercising, it is true, any authority in the general government, but constituting a class, beginning to be respected, and ready, at a proper time, to make itself felt in the affairs of Europe.

Let us now examine the part acted by the Church in laying the foundations of modern civilization, — a part, more important, perhaps, than that of the other elements which entered into it, inasmuch as the Church, in the fifth century, was already a vigorous institution, while the municipal or democratic principle was overborne for the time by the Barbarians, the feudal system had not yet emerged from surrounding confusion, and royalty existed only in name.

At this period the Church was altogether triumphant over Paganism, and partook of the majesty of the Empire: — it was the Roman Church. The irruption of the Barbarians re-imposed upon it the task of conversion; and the zeal of its ministers, during the fifth and sixth centuries, after being successfully employed in converting the Barbarians, was wasted in persevering attempts to reconstruct the Em-

pire by their means. But in vain; the Roman society was irrecoverably gone; and the Church itself for awhile seemed to be lapsing into barbarism; for while the Franks and Goths became priests and bishops, the bishops imitated the example of the conquerors, becoming leaders of bands, and making war, like the companions of Clovis. Meanwhile, however, the Church upheld effectually, for its own protection, the doctrine of separation between the temporal and spiritual powers; and introduced into the West the monastic order, as an asylum for the weak from the violence of the strong, and an additional barrier against the Barbarians. Then came the reign of Charlemagne, which gave the Church new vigor, and definitively established the Pope as its permanent head. On his death a relapse followed in ecclesiastical, as it did in civil affairs; and the Church endeavored strenuously, but imperfectly, to maintain its unity and purity by means of councils, which were the prevalent usage of the feudal age. But every thing tended, at that period, to the isolation of men; the clergy were infected with the same spirit; and extreme abuses, and much depravation of manners, were introduced by it, where they should least have place. This did not and could not last; better feelings, principles, and practises subsequently obtained; the Church rallied again; the necessity of order, system, organization, was more strongly felt than ever; and a genuine reformation took place throughout the Christian Church. It was a movement rendered illustrious by the talents of Gregory VII as the spiritual head of the Christian world; and signalized also by the remodelling of the monasteries, and the introduction therein of the severe rules of Saint Norbert and Saint Bernard.

What, during this period, was the Church doing for the civilization of Europe?

In the first place, it was the great instrument of the moral and intellectual, as well as the religious, improvement of mankind. It began by converting the Barbarians.

It was the only intellectual pursuit or profession of the times. All other classes of men operated upon their fellows by the impression of mere force: this employed the agency of reason, persuasion, moral considerations. The literature and science of Europe owe their developement to the clergy, who not only sustained and accelerated the intellectual movement of their age, but did it in the name of a system of doctrines and precepts, which, independently of its qualities as a rule of faith and salvation, was far superior to what the ancient world had known. In the East, intelligence is altogether religious: among the Greeks it was altogether human. The effect of the intellectual culture of the clergy upon the intellectual developement of modern Europe has been to combine the two principles, so as to give equal scope to knowledge in both temporal and spiritual relations, and thus to elevate and improve essentially its general character.

Secondly, it exercised the most salutary influence in reforming the vicious usages of the social system, and repressing the universal recurrence to force, by which society was perpetually torn and agitated. Thus it labored to bring about the enfranchisement of serfs, which it eventually accomplished; it sought to substitute mild and more rational laws in the place of the barbarous customs which then obtained. And the history of the feudal age is full of the examples of the untiring efforts of the clergy to correct the passion of rapine and war; to introduce sentiments of order, peace, and mutual good will; in a word, to counteract the violent spirit of barbarism. Who has not heard of 'the peace of God,' and 'the truce of God,' expedients of the clergy to abate the infuriate rage of strife, and give to the human race occasional breathing times from war?

But while the Church was so useful in these respects, standing as it were alone to stem the tide of barbarism, — in its political influences, its influences upon government and human liberty, it was undoubtedly injurious. It possessed,

and long retained, the monopoly as it were of science and philosophy. Its tendency, its effects, its legislation, had for object the establishment of power, sometimes in the form of a theocratic, sometimes of a monarchical, system. When feeble, the Church sought to shelter itself under the name and *prestige* of the Empire: when strong, it undertook to claim that authority as its own, and to exercise temporal, as well as spiritual, power. It was natural enough that, in such lawless times, the Church should have been glad to strengthen its hands by such means; for the very purpose of religion is restraint, restraint of the passions, the appetites, the will; and therefore, especially at that time, the Church, in its anxiety to check the licentiousness of men, could not fail to sympathize with principles of government, which impaired their liberty. Thus it happened that the Church was apt to be found on the side of despotism, and occasionally to call in its aid; and thus it came to be adverse, in some sort, to the expansion of the public liberties in Europe.

Reviewing the ground we have passed over, from the fifth to the twelfth century, it will be perceived that we are now in possession of all the elements of the European political system except royalty, which had not yet reached the decisive crisis of its full developement. But we have the *elements* of political system only: we have not the system itself. If we look at the aspect of things in the eighteenth century, we shall see two grand objects occupying the scene of the world, namely, a government and a people antagonist to, or at least reciprocally acting upon, each other, and together constituting a nation. Nobles, clergy, commons,—all appear, displaying their own peculiar features, but each subordinate to the two primary powers in society, the government and the people. But, prior to the twelfth century, who hears of a people, a nation, a national government? We discern the germs of a nation, of a government; but not the thing itself, nor any thing which deserves the

name. All is local, special, separate; there is no generality of aim, no principle of political combination, nothing in the broad sense public, no true nationality. It is the peculiarity, which distinguishes the modern, from the primitive, Europe.

When, and how, did Europe undergo the striking transformation, which the fact in question implies? This is the point we now have to consider. And we are now prepared to discriminate the successive epochs in the history of European civilization, and to signalize the specific properties of each, with reference to this ultimate aim and end. We distinguish three great periods. 1. The period of elementary formation, when the original principles of the political system are disengaged from the chaos of barbarism, and arise in their peculiar forms, but each independent, and isolated from the rest: — which extends from the fifth to the twelfth century. 2. The second period is that, wherein these elements appear in the process of transformation, of attempt at combination, without yet giving birth to any thing regular, general, or durable: — which lasts until the sixteenth century. 3. Lastly, the period of developement properly so called, when European society assumes a definite form, follows a determinate direction, aims at a clear and precise object: — a period, which begins at the sixteenth century, and is still pursuing its vigorous and resistless march.

It is necessary to premise these explanations, because, without them, the period, which we now enter, would seem to be an age of returning confusion, a time of aimless movements, of fruitless agitations; of incessant activity, but no advancement; of innumerable attempts, terminating in no accomplished end.

To begin, we have the Crusades, the first great shock given to European society in general, after the destruction of the Roman Empire. Never, before, had modern Europe concurred in any single event, or been stirred by the same

sentiment. The Crusades, in fact, revealed to men the existence of a Christian Europe, a great Republic of nations, having a common origin, ideas in common, purposes in common. At the same time, and by virtue of the same impulse, a spirit of nationality manifested itself; for, in the universal camp of the Crusaders, men had learned to perceive, to feel, and to cherish, their more immediate community of interests as grouped into nations.

Still the Crusades, moving all Europe, and gathering its thousands under their national banners, were, in their inception, the spontaneous movement of individuals, not the organized acts of men acting under and through the impulse of governments; — and such they appear in substance to the end. Who were the first Crusaders? Popular bands of nameless men, led on by Peter the Hermit, followed rather than conducted by a few obscure knights, and losing themselves among the hostile tribes of Asia Minor. The feudal nobility then caught the infection; and they also banded themselves for Palestine, under the command of Godfrey of Bouillon. It was impossible to withstand the universal enthusiasm: kings at last assumed the red cross; and Philip Augustus, Cœur-de-Lion, Saint Louis, led great armies of their nobles and vassals to perish in Syria and Egypt. But, throughout, it is a popular impulsion working through the whole European society, and not the direction of the governing will of individuals acting upon nations, in the manner that England and France would now make war. And as the Crusades began and continued in popular impulse, so also, when that died away, they terminated, without having secured their object, although the resources and the means of conquest were more amply possessed by the crusaders at the end, than at the beginning, of the period.

What, then, produced, and what determined, this universal popular movement of Europe?

The Crusades originated, it is clear, in two causes, a moral and a social one, namely, — the religious impulse,

which sought the reseue of the Holy Sepulchre as a great duty of Christian faith; — and the social impulse, which demanded active enterprise, a wider horizon, a field and scope of exertion, for the ardent and adventurous minds of Europe, still impressed with the errant tendencies which brought them from the North.

They were determined, not by lassitude of the Holy War, — for lassitude belongs to the individual, not to successive generations, — and how could men in the thirteenth century be fatigued by the labors of their fathers in the twelfth? — No, not by lassitude of the war, but by a revolution in their sentiments, their moral and social impulses. — First, the moral cause, the religious motive, had ceased to act upon men. By intercourse with each other, by experience of the different forms of society in the Greek Empire and among the Mahometans, the Crusaders, and through them the rest of Europe, became somewhat liberalized in sentiments. Their intellectual horizon was enlarged. Religion did not lose its influence over their minds, but they no longer regarded the possession of a rock in Palestine as its highest or worthiest aim. — Secondly, their social condition underwent a change. Many of the barons had been compelled to alienate their fiefs to others, or to raise money by granting away their rights to the towns; many of them lost a portion of their power by the suspension of its exercise. Thus it happened that the numbers of the small fiefs was greatly diminished, and their possessors attached themselves to some great feudatory or to their suzerain. Commerce also received a start, directly and indirectly, from these far expeditions, and thus augmented the wealth of the burghers and the consequence of the towns. In fine, men were brought together and taught to act in concert, so that the seeds of public policy were sown among the sovereigns, and of extended enterprise and industry among the commons; and a spirit of centralization, of national combination, and of activity with reference thereto, made its appearance in

Europe, giving men a sphere of adventure at home, more attractive than the distant and unfruitful wars of the Holy Land.

It is now time we should take a retrospect of the rise and formation of royalty, which at this period begins to assume the importance ever after maintained by it in Europe. Long before, of course, it existed in its elementary state; for the age of the Invasion shows to us the barbarian and the imperial royalty in presence of each other, contending for the mastery. The royalty of the Barbarians was, we know, essentially elective, the power conferred by military chiefs upon that one among them, who by bravery and ability was most competent to rule. It was monarchy in its most imperfect forms. The royalty of the Empire was totally different; it was the personification of the Republic; the concentration, in the hands of the Emperor, of the majesty and sovereignty of the people and senate of Rome. Such was it in its origin. Afterwards, when the Empire embraced the Christian religion, a new qualification was communicated to the sovereign power, namely, the idea of religious derivation or sanction, of authority by the favor of God. In France, Italy, Spain, England, we find royalty modified from time to time by these different elements of pretension, down to the age of feudalism. Then, a king was nominally the chief suzerain over other subordinate suzerains, the baron of barons, and through them of their vassals; but practically, and in fact, he was only the greatest of the feudal lords in his Kingdom. But in the twelfth century, monarchy assumes a more determinate, and in the same degree a more just and rational, character. We have noticed the extreme disorder, the downright anarchy, of the feudal age, the lawlessness of spirit, which the elevated principles and voluntary obligations of chivalry could only suffice to attemper and check, but not to control. Out of the very necessity of things grew this better function of modern royalty, distinct from its barbarian, imperial, religious, or feudal

origin, — namely, that of the depositary and protector of public order, of extended justice, of the common weal, that of the great magistrate, centre, and bond of society. And it is by this quality that, contemporaneously with the Crusades, royalty becomes the prominent actor in the affairs of Europe. The knowledge of this fact will prepare our minds to see it become the dominant influence, at the close of the period of transition, of recombination, which we are at present considering.

This period, it is needful again to suggest, is the period of abortive attempts, of great enterprises, of glorious purposes, of noble and elevated intentions, of stupendous sacrifices, resulting apparently in universal failure. The termination of the Crusades, we have seen; and similar to it were all the attempts to establish the public liberties on a legitimate basis, which constituted so much of the business of mankind from the twelfth until the sixteenth century. — These attempts were of two kinds; — one, having for its object to secure a unity of action in society by giving to some social element a fixed predominance over the rest, and the other, to reconcile them all, and give to each its due share of influence.

Of these various attempts, one aimed to render the organization of society theocratic, to subject all the other powers of the body politic to the Church. This idea sprang up very naturally in the minds of men conscious of their vast moral and intellectual superiority to all around them; but it encountered, happily, irresistible obstacles in the way of success. The very nature of the Christian religion was hostile to it; — a religion, whose theory, essence, and spirit it is to act upon man through the influence of moral springs, of persuasion, of inducements addressed to the faith and the will, — and not by forceful agency upon the physical man. Another obstacle, equally potent, was the feudal aristocracy, the conquerors and their descendants, who, if they accepted the doctrines of a new religion at the hands of the clergy,

did not the less regard the clergy as of the conquered race, and who, retaining their notions of barbarous independence and superiority for centuries after they ceased to be justified by existing facts, were ever the great opponents of the Church. Kings manfully struggled awhile, but gave in at length; commons welcomed the yoke; but knights and barons held fast by their independence to the end. Finally, the Church found weakness in its own frame; in the schisms and heresies of its members, and in the practice of celibacy, which, if it separated men from domestic cares and enjoyments, yet compelled the clergy to recruit their order from the laity, instead of raising up an hereditary priesthood, a separate religious caste, the only solid foundation of theocratic rule. Thus, even after the German princes of the proud and powerful House of Hohenstaufen had been compelled to bow before the authority of the Pope, the Church received a check in its onward progress from the universal reaction of sovereigns and people, in every part of Europe. And from the thirteenth century to the present time, the Church, no longer having courage or means to seek to impose a temporal yoke upon mankind, has continually found itself obliged to act more and more on the defensive merely, against the antagonist force of the laity.

The next attempt, that of the Commons to communicate a republican organization to Europe, was more brilliant in its prosecution, more lamentable in its failure. It began, as of right, in imperial Italy, with all its glorious reminiscences of the Roman Republic. There, the Barbarians did not gain either a general, or in any part a tranquil, possession of the country. Calabria, Apulia, Ravenna, and other cities and tracts of Italy, continued to depend on the Greek division of the Empire. Venice, Rome, Genoa, Gaeta, Naples, Amalfi, Pisa, were either never conquered by the Lombards, or held so transiently, that the municipal organization of the Empire, and the spirit of self-defence, remained to them in full vigor. They became the refuge of the wealthy, and

the rallying points of the free. Hence, the great cities of Italy speedily rose to be the prominent objects on the face of affairs. The feudal aristocracy, unable here to rely upon their personal independence as elsewhere, came to act in alliance with them, or, as more generally happened, entered and abode within their walls, assuming the condition of mere citizenship. This combination, of the liberties of the primitive Italians, the unsubdued relics of the Empire, with the fresh energies of the best among the conquering Barbarians, enabled the principles of civilization to develope themselves in the Italian corporations with prodigious rapidity, so as to elevate them, in a brief space, to the rank of powerful Republics.

Regarding the history of the great Italian cities in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, we are struck with two facts, apparently contradictory, yet undeniably true. You witness an exhibition of admirable courage, genius, and activity, resulting in the highest prosperity; that movement and that liberty, which are wanting to the rest of Europe. At the same time, the dissensions, the contests of parties, the wars between city and city, the crimes of individuals, present a scene of violence, scarcely inferior to that, which prevailed in regions completely conquered and exclusively held by Barbarians. The age was not ripe for liberty. And the Italian Republics fell by operation of the same principle, which stigmatizes and disgraces faction in every age and country. The minority preferred, in the madness of party-fury, to sacrifice itself, its principles, its honor, its very existence, every thing which it ever professed to hold dear, rather than subdue its wilful pride of opinion; and thus foreign domination was introduced into modern Italy.

If the attempt at republican organization failed in Italy, we may readily believe it could ill succeed elsewhere. In the South of France, where the municipal forms retained more of their purity and force than in the North, such an effort may be discerned, in the eleventh and twelfth centu-

ries; but the crusade against the Albigenses, which brought down upon southern and municipal France the northern and feudal France, effectually crushed the democratic tendencies of Provence and Languedoc. In Flanders, and on the banks of the Rhine, the democratic organization had free scope in the great towns, but was confined and held in check by the feudal nobility and their retainers, who controlled the country. It subsisted, therefore, and it occasionally warred upon and balanced the titled aristocracy; but it did not, as in Italy, gain possession of society. In after times, the union of the nobles and commons, in one part of the Netherlands, enabled them to withstand and repel the tyranny of their sovereign: their separation, in the other, rendered them his common victims. Amid the mountains of Switzerland, also, the coalition of the nobles and commons gave to them independence of their feudal head, and enabled them, like some of the Italian cities, to infuse a certain degree of stability and permanence into comparatively free institutions.

But nowhere, thus far, do we see these attempts succeed on a large scale, in extensive and powerful countries; nowhere, as yet, has any social element attained a fixed predominance in society. In France, Spain, England, and Germany, the wealth and importance of the commons, — insufficient to bestow on them exclusive power as in Italy, yet sufficient to render them respected and influential, — gave rise to a new class of attempts, namely, the scheme of imparting to all the social elements a concurrent and balanced action. Hence the States of Germany and France, the Cortes of the Peninsula, the Parliaments of England and Scotland, all of them great assemblies, wherein kings, nobles, clergy, and commons endeavored to act in concert for the general good of their respective nations.

Now the history of these assemblies in the Peninsular Kingdoms, and in France, shows to us, that their intervention in public affairs was irregular and occasional only, not systematic, uniform, and permanently effective as instru-

ments of government or of concerted national action. In France, especially, they were a kind of political *pis-aller*, which kings and people had recourse to on special emergencies, when some special difficulty occurred, which they knew not well how otherwise to remedy: — reluctantly attended by the commons except when they had some great point to gain, — favored by the kings only when they were bankrupt of treasure, — and neglected by the nobles and clergy, who felt that they had other means of acting upon the body politic. In parts of Spain, their convocation was more frequent, and their influence more marked; but their general character was the same in the Peninsula as in France. In Germany, the attempts at political organization, being commenced later, were of course more slowly advanced, than in the rest of Europe. There, as among the Sclavonian tribes, and in the further North, the fusion of the social elements is not even yet accomplished. Elective kings, ecclesiastical barons in possession of their ancient fiefs, free cities exercising actual sovereignty, villenage still in full existence, — attest how far in the rear of the rest of Europe, these nations must have stood, in the thirteenth century.

In England, it was otherwise. There, owing to causes peculiar to that country, the mixture and joint action of the several elementary parts of society at once presents itself to the view. On the one hand, the barons were not of sufficient power individually, as on the continent, to act efficiently each within his own peculiar sphere; and of course the habit of association and of concerted action early gained a footing among the upper aristocracy, the great lay and ecclesiastical barons. Hence the regularity of their intervention in public affairs as the grand council of the monarchy, becoming at last the House of Peers. The House of Commons grew up insensibly by the conjunction of the lesser barons with the burgesses; until finally they, with the Lords, came to constitute the Parliament of the realm, and thus

rendered the government a balanced system of king, barons, clergy, and commons: — which circumstance, as we shall hereafter see, while, in respect of political freedom, it gave Britain the advantage of France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, has proved, in the nineteenth century, the cause of her being manifestly less advanced as compared with France.

No influence, then, has yet gained possession of Europe: we have not yet reached the crisis of the new formation, toward which the institutions of Europe tended. That change is now at hand: it was prepared in the fifteenth, it was consummated in the sixteenth, century. The universal movement of mankind in the fifteenth century was to effect the centralization of interests, — to cause the spirit of *speciality*, of *localism*, to disappear, — to impress upon society a unity of action, — to produce the great relation of government and people.

Begin with France. It is the period of the national wars between the French and English, the struggle, in fact, of the former for the acquisition and assurance of their national independence. While these wars tended so directly to confirm the nationality of feeling, which the insular position of England had already infused into its people, it effectually aroused the same spirit in France. The House of Valois successfully competed with the English Edwards and Henrys for the throne of France; and that same House effected the reunion of the great fiefs and provinces, and thus reconstructed the Kingdom. Royalty is evidently gathering to itself energy and respect. Charles VII keeps in his pay a permanent military force; and while the bonds of feudal service are relaxed, the *taille*, one of the principal sources of royal revenue, becomes perpetual. At the same time royal parliaments are multiplied. A fixed revenue, an army, and the regular administration of justice, — what are these but the great engines of a central power, a regular government? Louis XI, by partially humbling the great nobles, and by

having recourse to policy in the conduct of affairs, instead of appealing on all occasions to brute force, renders royalty decidedly predominant in France.

Look at Spain. A series of events, precisely parallel to those we have just indicated, is occurring there, although in a state of facts, which, to the superficial observer, might seem to be different. The Peninsula becomes freed of a foreign power by the final subjugation of the Moors. Castile and Aragon, the two great subdivisions of Spain, are united by the marriage of Ferdinand and Isabel. And how like to the character and policy of Louis XI were those of Ferdinand the Catholic!

In Germany it is the same case. The House of Austria acquires the imperial diadem, and thenceforth the throne becoming to all practical purposes hereditary, monarchy gains the ascendant in the Empire.

So it is in England. At the expiration of the war of the Roses, we find the great baronial houses broken or extinct, and the people anxious for peace and stability at any price. The consequence is that the Tudors, without possessing any legal prerogatives, which preceding kings had not occasionally exercised, become virtually despotic in despite of the Parliament.

As to Italy, if royalty did not in name appropriate the nation, yet it became supreme in substance. For, at this time, most of the Republics fell under the domination of individual Italians, while foreign spoilers seized upon Lombardy and Naples. The scorn, the indignation, the despair, the madness, with which the Italian patriots of that day witnessed the invasion of their beautiful country, with all its premature civilization, by the Germans, French, and Spaniards, — men at that time a century behind the Italians in knowledge, refinement, every thing belonging to cultivated life, — are forcibly illustrated by the not dissimilar emotions whereof we ourselves are witnesses among the Poles.

Again. Contemporaneously with the developement of

monarchy, we see national alliances grow up, foreign relations begin to exist, and the science of diplomacy springs into being, falling, at the same time, into the hands of the kings, as the only intelligent central power, competent to the conduct of complex international transactions.

Whatever part of Europe we regard, we see the traditional liberties of each country perish, in the fifteenth century, before the irresistible progress of the monarchical principle. The free hearted and the high minded mourned in vain over the prostration of their hopes, their desperate but ineffectual struggles against the victorious march of tyranny. To them, the all-pervading prevalence of usurpation and aggression, the universal success of public crime and universal failure of public virtue, was an inscrutable mystery in the ways of Providence. We now discern how it was that Europe could attain its future destiny, and the great principles of political right work out their eventual triumph, only after the scattered social elements should have been compressed together,and brought to act with concentrated energy upon the intellectual and political condition of Christendom. We can perceive, though not they, how the blood of so many blessed martyrs of freedom was not spilled for naught.

For how prodigious was the intellectual developement of that age! What extraordinary revolutions then occurred in the moral and economical, as well as political, condition of the world!

First we have the bold attempt of the clergy themselves, at the period of the great schism of the West, and by means of the Councils of Constance and Bâle, to reform the abuses of the Church, especially to abridge the pecuniary exactions and the general ecclesiastical authority of the See of Rome. This project fails in the hands of the clergy, and is then taken up by Charles VII in France and the Diet of Mentz in Germany, who adopt, and for awhile maintain, the Pragmatic Sanction, consecrating the election of bishops, the sup-

pression of first fruits, and the reform of the principal abuses introduced into the Church. But the Pragmatic is afterwards abandoned; and the work of reform, which suffered shipwreck under the guidance of bishops and kings, is undertaken in the same age by the people. John Huss and Jerome of Prague are condemned to the stake, as Wickliffe had been in England; and their followers, like the Albigenses, are hunted by fire and sword; but the spirit of reformation, although checked for the time, is abroad among men, ere long to sweep over Europe.

In the same age, modern literature springs up, phenix-like, from the ashes of the ancient: Dante, Petrarca, and Boccaccio make their advent among men, each of them throwing off as his unconsidered productions the model-works of Italian composition, and each of them exerting all his powers and influence to revive the knowledge and admiration of the remains of Greek and Roman genius. Meanwhile the Empire of the Turks is established in Constantinople, and the fugitive Greeks bring into Italy abundant means of studying the civilization of the ancient world.

Out of these events arose the Classic School of philosophy as it was called, which, in its taste, opinions, and spirit, was the very counterpart of the *Encyclopédistes* of the eighteenth century. Looking at the moral and intellectual condition of the upper clergy and men of letters of this epoch, we perceive the same spectacle of enervated life mixed with extraordinary boldness of inquiry; — of sybarite manners and sceptical opinions; — of extraordinary genius running riot in all licentiousness; — which characterized the Diderots and Voltaires of France. In the court of Leo as in that of Louis, among the ecclesiastical aristocracy of the one, as among the lay aristocracy of the other, each was preparing, unconsciously, a revolution destined to level their corrupt privileges in the dust.

Finally, this is the epoch of the great inventions, discoveries, and enterprises, which changed the face of the world.

It is the period of the Portuguese expeditions along the coast of Africa, of Vasco de Gama's passage of the Cape of Good Hope, of the discovery of the New World by Columbus, of the marvellous extension of European commerce. Gunpowder changes the whole system of war; the mariner's compass that of navigation. Paper, painting in oils, and the process of engraving on copper, if not now invented, yet now for the first time come into general use. And to crown the whole, the art of printing, that mightiest engine of human knowledge and improvement, is vouchsafed to Europe. All these are the gifts, which the fifteenth century bequeathed to its successors, the first fruits of the centralization of effort, of the union and cooperation of minds, which distinguished the political spirit of the age.

Down to the period we have now reached, the great difficulty has been, amid the general dissolution of society and incoherence of its elements, to seize any general idea, which might serve to explain the scattered facts. But now, society acts in the general; all the relations of society are blended together, acting and reacting upon each other, so as to render the task of analysis difficult, whereas before the difficulty lay in the task of combination. But the sixteenth century was the era of one great event, — the Reformation, — which colored every thing, and gives a clue to the dominant spirit, the controlling spring, of the age.

All important historical events have a determinate career: — their consequences may last for an indefinite space, but they themselves have an opening and a close. The Reformation begins with the preachings and publications of Luther, early in the sixteenth century; and it is accomplished, it ceases to be the predominant fact before our eyes, at the middle of the seventeenth century, when, by the treaty of Westphalia, the Catholic and the Protestant States formally recognized each the other, and agreed that religious opinion should cease to be the dividing line, the main principle of alliance, among the nations of Europe.

Reflecting upon this period, we shall rest satisfied that it was an age of great men, and of great events produced by their agency, that is, of peculiar activity of MIND. Taking Europe in the general, at the commencement of the period, we find France and Spain, — Francis and Charles, — contending, nominally, for Italy or for Germany, but in truth for the preponderance in Europe. Then we have in France the wars of the League, on the surface a religious contest, in the substance a contest between feudal aristocracy and royalty, suspended on the accession of Henry IV, but revived under Louis XIII in the administration of Richelieu, continued in the wars of the Fronde, and consummated by the policy of Louis XIV. In Germany and the North of Europe, the Austrians now become potent; Gustavus Vasa and Sweden enter upon the scene; Prussia springs out of the secularization of the Teutonic Order; Poland and Hungary bear up the banner of Christendom against the advance of the Crescent; and the wars of Turkey and of the Thirty Years give their place in history to the great names of Central and Northern Europe. In the West, the United Provinces shake off the yoke of Spain; the Church of England is created by Henry VIII and consolidated by Elizabeth; France and England have their national literature, and their schools of philosophy, with Bacon and Descartes for the world's teachers; — and the great colonial enterprises of Spain, Portugal, England, France, revolutionize the commercial system of all Europe. Finally, the Roman Church, while shaken to the centre by the progress of change, yet finally succeeds, in the Council of Trent, to assure itself a settled supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs; and through the new agency of the Jesuits, gains an indirect influence in secular affairs almost equivalent to its ancient direct temporal power. In the midst of this multiplicity of great events, it is evident that the Reformation was the greatest: this,

> Above the rest
> In shape and gesture proudly eminent,
> Stood like a tower.

As it fastened its name, so did it stamp its character, upon the epoch.

What is that character? What is the congenial soul, which animates that glorious frame? The Reformation has been ascribed, on the one hand, by its adversaries, to corrupt local or personal causes, as the ambition of princes jealous of the ecclesiastical power, the cupidity of nobles covetous of the church-lands, or a quarrel between two monastic orders for exclusive trust in the sale of indulgences. By its friends, on the other hand, it has been ascribed to a general conviction of the enormity of certain abuses in the Church, its pride, its luxury, its traffic of indulgences, or the like, — and to the necessity of reforming such abuses. Neither side is the full truth. Those were incidental or associate causes, which undoubtedly exerted much influence on the course of events, but did not constitute the fountain head of action, the *causa causans* in the series of causes and effects. The Reformation will not be understood, nor its permanent influence upon the progress of society appreciated, by regarding it as an accident of personal or local interests, nor by regarding it as a philosophical scheme of moral purity: — it was the irresistible impulse of the European MIND to think for itself, by its own energies, and upon its own volitions, — the insurrection of human intellect against intellectual domination; — and it developed itself in and through resistance to the Church, because, during the long reign of ignorance, violence, anarchy, and merely tentative organization, which covered the period between the eighth and the sixteenth centuries, mind was, in a manner, the peculiar, almost the exclusive, province of the Church.

With this idea before us, we shall be guided in surety through all the vicissitudes of the Reformation and the events of the time, and arrive at a clear conception of the part it played in the civilization of Europe. But while the emancipation of thought, the overthrow of absolutism in spiritual things, was the general result of the Reformation,

it was by no means the set principle or design of the reformers. They were themselves the instruments and parties in a movement, which they did not and could not view in the great whole. Hence they subjected themselves, by their conduct, to two principal topics of reproach, namely, first, the multiplicity of sects, the extreme license in spiritual inquiries, which they introduced, — and, secondly, the tyrannical cruelty of their measures of repression. They struck down the Roman Church, they abolished unity of sentiment and action in religion, to do so was the very aim and scope of their endeavors; and yet each new sect set itself up as the one, only, infallible church of God, and persecuted its fellow-dissenters with a fierce intolerance of zeal, not surpassed by that very Inquisition, which was their common bugbear and byeword of bigotry. Servetus in Geneva, — Grotius and Barneveldt in Holland, — the Puritans in England, — the Episcopalians in Scotland, — could testify, by the persecution they underwent, that what each of the reformers meant by tolerance and liberty of conscience, was tolerance and liberty of conscience for his own opinions, not for those of his neighbors. They undertook to extirpate heretics at the stake without perceiving that they were all heretics alike; that neither of them acquired, by seceding from the Roman Church, a right to style himself orthodox, or to usurp the temporal prerogatives of orthodoxy. They understood not the grandeur of their own magnificent work. For the Reformation was not the triumph of the doctrines of Luther, Calvin, Cranmer; it was not the triumph of this or that sect of Christians; it was the triumph of free enquiry and the rights of conscience in Christendom.

In this event we have reached the Europe of our own times; — the Europe of only two subdivisions, the governed and the governors; — the Europe, where the government and the people stand facing each other, visibly and permanently *en présence*; — the Europe of popular rights and representation, religious independence, and royalty reduced

to it proper functions of magistracy; — Europe of the English Revolution, Europe of the French Revolution.

Let the mind summon up before itself the prominent facts, or classes of facts, in the history of society and of its progress towards civilization, in that modern Europe, to which the present times belong. In Western Europe, they will be, undeniably, the English Revolution, the government and policy of Louis XIV, the intellectual developement of France in the middle of the eighteenth century, and the French Revolution. These will occupy the foreground in the picture presented to the mind's eye, the front line in the marshalling of events; and if others come before the mind, they will be quickly set aside, either as being subordinate to those we have designated, or episodes only in the great work of the age. And in proceeding to analyze the whole series of facts, it will be seen that the present has been the age of political, as the anterior one was of religious, enfranchisement.

Our examination of the progress of civilization from the fall of the Roman Empire to the Reformation, has put us in the train of comprehending the movement and the aim of modern Europe. We have witnessed the introduction, by the Barbarians, of the new elements of civilization, — their confused and indeterminate state for a time, — their grouping into sets of interests in the institutions of the feudal age, — the beginning of a process of larger combination, of incipient centralization, in and by the Crusades, — the successive attempts of each of the great social elements to gain dominion of society, and the success in this respect of royalty, — followed by prodigious activity of human intellect in arts and arms, in science, letters, inventions, — and thereupon the irresistible effort of mind, thus actively in exercise, to emancipate itself from absolutism in spiritual matters. That is, the cycle of movement in ecclesiastical affairs was fully described, while in politics it was yet imperfect: — the religious, took precedence of the political, revo-

lution. This happened in consequence of the exclusive power of the Church having risen and attained its climax in advance of government. The Church had been long in the field, as a visible and central power: — of course, a public opinion, a sentiment by the governed of their distinct interest as contrasted with that of the governors, first grew up in reference to the Church. While the progress of knowledge acted first upon the Church, that very fact, the pending struggle between the spirit of religious freedom and the spirit of religious domination, tended to strengthen the hands of royalty, the only active political principle of the times. Mind, having fought its battle with the Church, could not fail soon to assail Government.

The struggle began in England, for reasons intrinsic to the history and institutions of England.

At this period, royalty, as we have seen, had become the leading element in European society every where; but, in England, under very peculiar circumstances. It would be difficult to show that, practically, the Tudors were any more despostic than the Plantagenets; at any rate, there is no want, either of arbitrary princes, or of flagrant examples of tyranny, in the history of the elder dynasty. But if Edward I or Edward III tyrannized occasionally, it is very certain they did not pretend to do so from any independent, primitive, and exclusive sovereignty inherent in them as kings; still less did they assume so to do by virtue of the divine right of royalty. The extravagant pretensions of royalty, its offensive cant, the reduction of royalty to a system, — it is this, which distinguishes the Tudors and Stuarts from the Plantagenets. While, therefore, on the Continent, the progress of royalty at this time was marked by the actual and assured possession of absolute power, in England, the correspondent change it underwent was the being systematized, and fenced about with the doctrines and claims of absolute power.

Moreover, in England, the work of the Reformation had

been done, but done imperfectly: it was not, as in Spain, Italy, France, and parts of Germany, actually put down, nor, as in various other parts of the Continent, did it have full career. This arose from the circumstance that, in England, for good and sufficient considerations of self-interest, power made itself revolutionary. Henry VIII put himself at the head of the Reformation. The King and the established Church divided between them the spoils of the Pope, the riches and the power of the Catholic Church. So far as regarded the rights of conscience, the liberty of thinking and acting for one's self, the people were not slow to discover that small account had been had of them in the measures of church-reformation. To know this, and to act upon the knowledge, — to feel the sense of injustice, and to demand redress, — were things, which followed one after the other as naturally as water descends.

Again, the age of Elizabeth, we all know, was an epoch of extraordinary wisdom, as well in legislation as in philosophy and literature. There is yet no philosopher, who may look down upon Bacon, no lawyer more highly reputed than Coke, no poet who dims the fame of Shakspeare. It was an age, also, of great commercial prosperity, and from that, as from other causes, the wealth and consequence of the gentry, of the lesser aristocracy, acquired a vast augmentation. In short, the people possessed that sense of strength built on solid prosperity, and of capability for self-government derived from knowledge, which is very apt to deal somewhat cavalierly with the false pretensions of arbitrary power. It was the case, to a certain degree, on the Continent; but it was only in England that local institutions offered means of action and convenient points of support.

England possessed, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, many ingredients of personal security and private freedom in her laws and system of government, which were wanting in other countries of Europe. Magna Charta, so often confirmed, and extended by statutes, had consecrated

the general principles of right, and rendered them familiar to English ears. Abundant precedents occurred in her history to encourage and sustain the efforts of political reformers. Special and local institutions existed, such as trial by jury, the right of assembling and of bearing arms, the independence of municipal and other local administrations, all eminently congenial to freedom. Finally, the House of Commons was a mighty engine of power for the people. Under the Plantagenets, it intervened in affairs of government sparingly and hesitatingly, and rather on the invitation of the kings, than of its own motion, although it faithfully guarded the individual liberties of the subject. Under the Tudors, it was less firm in the defence of private rights than before, but it became a more active agent in public affairs, especially after the Reformation, which rendered the princes more dependant upon it for political support. And at this period, in consequence of the diminution of their independent revenues, the kings began to have frequent occasion to ask large supplies of Parliament.

Englishmen, therefore, enjoyed facilities, peculiar to themselves, for accomplishing a political revolution; and they were borne forward in the prosecution of it by two national exigencies, the need of religious freedom and that of political freedom, both conspiring together under favorable circumstances. Moreover, the spiritual and the temporal power being concentrated in the person of the King, rendered him the object of the combined attack. Such is the philosophy of the English Revolution. It was in its essence a struggle for liberty, — for the religious party as a means, for the political party as an end. It was undertaken in an age and among a people devoted to religion, religious opinions and passions served as its instruments, but its primary design and its ultimate object were political; the acquisition of freedom, the overthrow of absolute power. This will appear from a brief analysis of it, in the successive stages of its progress.

Three great parties in that crisis, three subordinate revolutions, were produced on the scene ; and a double character, combined of political and religious, belongs to each of these parties and each of these revolutions.

First came the Royalists, the party of legal reform, led by Clarendon, Colepepper, Capel, and not opposed by Hampden ; statesmen, who reprobated the arbitrary measures of Charles, his attempts to levy taxes illegally, his imprisonment of men for opinions uttered in Parliament, and who wished to establish fixed limits to the royal power, but who, at the same time, reverenced royalty, and deemed the ancient laws and usages of the country, if faithfully observed, as quite sufficient guaranties of liberty. Similar doctrines they applied to the Church, without desiring to change its form or substance.

After these, came the Presbyterians, the party of political revolution, who considered the ancient legal barriers inadequate to restrain the crown within due limits, who aimed at the infusion of greater popular influence into the national institutions, and who would change the substance but not the forms of the government. Of this party Hampden, Hollis, and St. John may be considered the representatives. They were content to retain royalty as the distinctive feature of the government, but after giving the decided preponderance to the House of Commons as the popular branch of it: — in short, they would have established what La Fayette, during the Three Days, styled a monarchy surrounded by republican institutions. Predominant in this party, and giving it a name, were the Presbyterians in religion, who sought to revolutionize the Church by introducing a new form of hierarchy, the Presbyterian in lieu of the Episcopal.

Finally came the Republicans in politics, and their associates the Independents in religion, who demanded a radical change in the institutions of the country, a social as well as a political and religious revolution. This party consisted of some men republican in religion and politics by principle,

such as Ludlow and Milton; of others, who were interested republicans, men of circumstance, such as Ireton, Cromwell, Lambert, more or less sincere in the outset, but in the sequel conducted into the paths of personal ambition by temper or the necessities of their position; and of others, wild Fifth Monarchy men and frantic enthusiasts, who looked for the immediate coming of the Savior, but deemed themselves meanwhile the only rightful possessors of the earth.

Each of these parties rose to the surface, and exercised a temporary control of the Revolution, without proving able to maintain itself; for at the close of the civil war, although the Republicans were apparently triumphant, having shut out of the Long Parliament first the Royalists, and then the Presbyterians, so that only themselves remained in it, yet the Rump had lost the effective control of the country, and was indeed the common scorn of all England. The necessities of public order gave to Cromwell the inducement and the power to tread on the necks of his late party-associates, and to create himself Lord Protector of the realm. But his authority, after all, was a political necessity of the moment, to which the nation submitted as the only refuge from anarchy, but which neither Royalists, nor Presbyterians, nor Republicans, nor even the army itself, regarded as the legitimate settled government of England. His energy, his reputation, his sagacity, his personal popularity and influence, were the sole guaranties of his government; and of course, when he died, it fell.

Then came the Restoration, favored, because it gave back a government resting upon national traditions and the historical associations of the people, and because men were weary of the fleeting governments of the last twenty years, all equally destitute of stability, and all, as it seemed, incapable of securing constitutional freedom to the nation. The political corruption and moral depravity of the reign of Charles II are matters familiar to the memory; and while the vices and crimes of his brother, tolerated so long by the

nation, encouraged James II to undertake the restoration of religious and political despotism, the same circumstances had already weaned the country from its recovered attachment to the Stuarts. The Prince of Orange needed only to show himself in England to become its King.

And here the English Revolution, in the facts themselves, and independently of its moral influence, enters into the general course of political improvement in Europe. William III was the head of the great Protestant interest of Europe, — an interest identical with that of political freedom, — engaged, as the Stadtholder of republican Holland, in a desperate struggle with Louis XIV, absolute King in France, and aiming, as the world believed, to establish a universal monarchy, fatal to European liberties. England, neutral or hostile to the Protestant cause under Charles and James, now threw herself, with all her physical force and all the moral force of her example, into the league against Louis; and her intervention was decisive of its issue, and of the humiliation of France.

Allusion has been made, in another part of our subject, to the fact that in England the various elements of European civilization received their developement as it were simultaneously, and side by side, so that neither possessed a marked preponderance over the rest; and while the effect of this was, to an eminent degree, the communication of a character of practical good sense to the English school of politicians, it tended, at the same time, to render their political views exclusively English. It is the character of her statesmen and jurists as distinguished from those of the Continent. In the former, freedom is fortified by precedents: in the latter, by maxims and the reason of things. For on the Continent, and especially in France, as the elements of social order did not keep along together so equally, but came up successively, and each as it were alone, it happened that some one principle was at every epoch rendered more prominent, placed in a more vivid light, and made the subject of

individual study. The result of which was, that political liberty was developed more tardily in France, because it did not so soon attain sufficient vigor to contend successfully with absolute power; and yet, at the same time, general principles, large and comprehensive views of subjects, became more characteristic of the judicial and political philosophy of France.

Another thing is to be observed. On the Continent, it is peculiarly the influence of France, which acts upon the progress of European society, — upon its manners, social refinement, and civilization; as any one may be satisfied by carefully studying the times of the Barbaric Invasion, Charlemagne, the Crusades, Francis I, Louis XIV, and the Revolution. It would be a very simple explanation of this fact, to ascribe it to the prevalence of the French as the universally received diplomatic language of Europe. But why is the French language of thus universal application? Is not this universality the effect, rather than the prime cause? Is not the social influence of France, during the last three centuries especially, rather to be attributed to the peculiar genius of her people, to their characteristic socialness of temper, to their geographical position, to the combined authority of such a power and such a people placed as it were on the central vantage-ground of Europe? At any rate such is the fact, admitted by all reasoners, of whatever class or nation, who have had occasion to speculate on the history of the eighteenth century.

Now, in the reign of Louis XIV, it is evidently the court and government of France, which act upon the social condition of Europe: in that of Louis XV, it is the people and society of France. The foreign enterprises, the statesmanship and diplomacy of France, in the reign of Louis XIV, gave the tone to Europe. It was the great central power, which led in European affairs, by whose movements other nations shaped their policy, in reference to which they formed alliances; and it was the preponderance of France in Europe,

the political interest of the Kingdom, which Louis XIV aimed to promote in all his great enterprises, whether contending with Holland, Spain, Germany, or England. A similar spectacle presents itself within the Kingdom. Louis XIV was a *codifying* king, — one of those princes, who methodize the laws of the land; and this trait is characteristic of governments, which of their own motion act upon civilization. Under him, also, the administration of affairs became thoroughly systematized by the agency of Colbert and Louvois; — that is, the government was so organized that, on the one hand, its impulse could the most thoroughly circulate down through all the subdivisions of society, and on the other hand all the collective forces of the society be gathered up and most efficaciously exerted through the instrumentality of the government. Is it not, therefore, the *court* of Louis XIV, which acts upon France and upon Europe?

But what is the dominant influence in the reign of Louis XV? On his accession, France presented to the world the spectacle of a society greatly advanced in riches, force, and especially intellectual activity; the people were moving on with the impetus they had acquired from the government of his predecessor; but the energies of the government itself as such were utterly demoralized and exhausted. This, indubitably, is the fact: the causes of it are matter of question. It is common enough to ascribe it to the misfortunes and reverses of the closing years of the reign of Louis XIV: — the war of the Succession, the revocation of the edict of Nantes, the lavish profusion of the court, and the lamentable dissolution of manners, which sullied the splendors of Paris and Versailles. — These particulars by no means explain the change. Was not France in a worse condition of utter prostration at the beginning of the same reign? — Clearly so. But the government of France fell into decrepitude in the old age of Louis XIV, and lingered along in halting debility under his successor, because its vigor had

been derived from the individuals who administered it, and was unsustained by popular institutions or habitudes. — Neither the industry nor the mind of the nation partook of the feebleness of the government. Mind, especially, was in the full career of victory, although, it is true, engaged only in speculative pursuits, not mixing itself up with practical politics, and for that very reason, unchecked by difficulties, headstrong, and intoxicated with its own easy triumphs in the boundless realms of thought.

Reflect, now, upon the representations we have repeatedly suggested of the relative attitudes of the government and the people, as characterizing the political condition of Europe at this epoch. The two divisions of society, the governors and the governed, are stationed face to face; they are antagonist in their interests; they measure each others force; clearly, if one does not take the *initiative*, and give the lead to affairs, the other will do it. But the government of Louis XV was inert, inefficient, waiting to be acted upon, not stepping forth to act; and of course Society took up that ascendency in the movement of civilization, which seemed to be abandoned as a waif by Government, and by means of it impressed upon France and upon Europe that boldness and universality of inquiry, and that pervading sense of popular rights, which produced the French Revolution.*

* The views, contained in this Section, are mainly derived from the 'Cours d'Histoire' of M. Guizot. His discourses constitute a *resumé* of the whole mass of modern history bearing upon the subject; and it would be mere affectation to seek, upon such an occasion, to steer clear of his comprehensive and luminous deduction of the progress of political systems in modern Europe. M. Guizot cites no authorities; but many works will occur to the learned reader, as fitted to elucidate the obscurer parts of the subject; among which it may suffice to indicate the historical writings of Gibbon, Robertson, Hume, Hallam, Mills, Roscoe. Mably, Voltaire, Sismondi, James, and Michaud, as particularly pertinent and useful.

SECTION II.

Means of Knowledge and Opinion.—Political Organization of France before the Revolution.—Social Condition.—Reign of Louis XVI.—Court and Cabinet.—American War.—Financial Embarrassments.—Assembly of Notables.—States-General.—Neckar.—Mirabeau.—La Fayette.—Duke of Orleans.—Constitutional Monarchy.—Legislative Assembly.—National Convention.—The French Republic.—Robespierre.—The Reign of Terror.—The Directory.—Napoleon Bonaparte.—The Consulate.—The Empire.—Restoration of the Bourbons.—The Hundred Days.—Reign of Louis XVIII.—Charles X.—Recapitulation.

Whoever proposes to communicate a distinct idea of the *philosophy* of a complex body of events, must have a theory of his own for combining and explaining them,—a clue for his guidance through what otherwise would be but a labyrinth of doubt and confusion. His estimation of individuals, his judgment of things, will be, and indeed they ought to be, regulated by the principles of moral and political right, which form his creed. As he learns, so must he teach. Of mere necessity, he assumes a particular position, from which to regard events, as they rise up before him at the summons of memory. If he take that position without due inspection of the premises, he acts from prejudice: if it be the result of a full and conscientious examination of all the accessible elements of sound opinion, it is conviction. He ponders the constitution, capacity, and destinies of the human race,—scrutinizes men and studies events,—and the conclusions, which he reaches thereon, are, to him, facts,—the decisions of reason applied to the investigation of truth. His troth is his truth.

Nearly all the critical events of the French Revolution, civil or military, are ascertained with reasonable certainty, and the great mass of them so thoroughly, as to stand out

of the scope of question. In such an age as this, and such a country as France, events, which shook the world to its centre, could not fail to call a thousand pens into activity, to transmit the knowledge of them to future times. Broad streams of light have been thrown over the great or guilty beings, who, during the last half century, stalked in splendor and blood along the history of France. Observers of every degree of intelligence, from princes, statesmen, and generals down through each rank of society, even to menial servants, have given us their memoirs and speculations; and the most philosophic minds and brilliant geniuses have reared, out of the authentic records of the times, monuments of their political science and historical skill. No opinion has wanted its representative, no party has failed of its advocate, no event is without its memorialist.

Would we enter the councils of the constitutional reformers of France, the men of eighty nine, who, with mixed motives undoubtedly, but purposes mainly good, sought for the regeneration of their country? We may do so, in the writings of Bailly, Barbaroux, Buzot, Condorcet, Carnot, Roland, Dumouriez, Dumont, Lameth, De Stael. — Would we follow the wanderings and sympathize in the sufferings of the proscribed aristocracy? We have but to open the volumes of Campan, Larochejaquelein, Cléry, Châteaubriand, or Bertrand de Molleville. — Would we assist at the foundations of the Empire? Thibaudeau, Bourrienne, Savary, Fouché, Junot, DeBausset, show to us the whole interior of Napoleon's palace, the sublime conceptions which raised him above, and the manifold littlenesses which depressed him below, the dignity of his mission. — Leaving the senate and the court, would we contemplate France in that extraordinary series of military efforts, which changed the face of Europe? We have the great works of Dumas and Jomini, the thrilling narrations of Ségur, La Baume, and Rocca, the lucid essays of Gouvion Saint-Cyr, Foy, and

Fain, and not least of all, the voluminous dictations of Napoleon himself in his reclusion of Saint Helena. — Would we consider the opinions, and look into the passions of each hour, as the hour passed away, and before events had acquired false tints in the perspective of time? We may read the debates and the doings of the Commune of Paris, the Jacobin Club, and the Convention, side by side in the columns of the *Moniteur*. — Finally, would we know what philosophic history, in the retrospect of the whole, has to say in behalf of the judgment of posterity? We have the elaborate compositions of Toulongeon, Lacrételle, Mignet, Thiers, De Norvins, to speak to us in the name of France, while Southey, Scott, Londonderry, Napier, Alison, and a host of minor compilers, utter the sentiments of the most prejudiced observer, because the most uncompromising enemy, of the French Republic and Empire.

Here, therefore, is abundance of opinions, and of materials for opinion, touching the French Revolution. Every man, we repeat, has, and no man can avoid having, a general theory, which he applies to the incidents of the period. A foreigner, he is affected by personal or national prejudices, like Burke or Sir Walter Scott: — native to the country, he has party feelings, and is either tinctured with royalist prejudices like Lacrételle, or republican ones like Thiers. In America, if we view the matter as foreigners, we shall not, as national enemies: — And we cannot but view it in the faith of republican principles, of national independence, and of the inherent popular right of self-constitution, — because, in America, these are settled axioms, which all stand ready to maintain by voice, pen, or sword if need be, but which it were as idle to debate in each particular case, as to stop and anxiously reason out the doctrine of gravitation before venturing to set foot on earth in the daily avocations of life. And while it is my present aim, following the footsteps of Mignet especially, to present a rational *republican* idea of the French Revolution,

illustrations will be derived from sources peculiarly apt for the purposes of an American.

During the early years of the French Revolution, two of the great personages of our own history resided in France. They were men of genius, of wide political celebrity, of high official station for the time being, — and therefore would have been sought after, and would have possessed favorable opportunities of observation, under any circumstances. But America, and her successful essay to establish republican institutions, were then the passion of the day in France. Thomas Jefferson had written the American Declaration of Independence, Gouverneur Morris the Constitution of the United States. Of consequence, they were courted and caressed by all the ardent enthusiastic spirits of Paris. They became the personal friends, the associates of all hours, the familiar advisers, of the orators and statesmen of the Constituent Assembly. La Fayette, Duport, Barnave, Lameth, and Mounier adjusted the bases of their institutions in the drawing-room of Jefferson. When Madame de Stael met Morris for the first time, she singled him out for a set talk according to her custom in the company of such men, and insisted upon drawing him forth, because, said she, '*je vous entend cité de toutes parts.*' In the division of opinions, which afterwards grew up in the United States, Morris ranked with the federal party, as Jefferson did with the democratic; and the tendencies of mind, which thus led them into different political paths at home, are observable in their judgments of the French Revolution. But as both marked the course of events with the discriminating eye of men familiar with political passions and movements, each anticipated, with extraordinary precision, not only the general result of a series of events, but the particular effect and sequence of single ones, and looked as it were quite through the heart and soul of the times. At successive periods, it repeatedly happened to both of them to say to their friends in Paris, — 'Do such a thing, and such consequen-

ces will follow'; — or, 'Stop there, otherwise this, and this, and this will ensue'; — and the result has made their declaration to wear the semblance of prophecy. And withal, notwithstanding the predilections of Morris in favor of governments intrinsically stable and secure, it was in abstract points of opinions, not upon specific facts, that he and Jefferson differed concerning what was doing in France. Indeed, the writings of Jefferson, Morris, and Monroe, successive Ministers of the United States in France, furnish invaluable cotemporary memorials of the Revolution, from its first beginnings down to the time of the Directory.*

In the preceding Section we exhibited Government and Society in France, as placed, during the reign of Louis XV, in hostile, or at least adverse, attitudes. Let us approach and examine each of these objects more in detail. And,

First, the political organization of France at that period. In the time of Louis XVI, the government of France, owing to causes already explained, was an absolute monarchy, — that is, alliances were formed, armies raised, war made, taxes levied, laws enacted, by the sole authority of the King. Loyalty and a love of honor were the distinguishing traits of the *noblesse*, who alone appeared on the face of national affairs, civil or military. No public body intervened in the government except the parliament, that is, the great judicial body of Paris. For, in French history

* See Jefferson's 'Writings,' 'Memoirs and Correspondence' of Morris, and Monroe's 'View of the Conduct of the Executive in the Foreign Affairs of the United States connected with the Mission to the French Republic;' to which may be added the Diplomatic Correspondence of the American Revolution, Wait's State Papers, and the various published Documents touching the Claims of the United States on France: — all containing most authentic information pertinent to our purpose.

The French have been greatly struck, as they could not fail to be, by the correspondence of general opinion manifest in Jefferson and Morris, and especially the extraordinary sagacity and forecast displayed by Morris. 'Belle position, nous le répétons encore,' says the Journal des Dé-

and politics, it is to be understood that the word 'parliament' imports an assembly of magistrates, not a legislative assembly, as in Great Britain. In France, the parliaments possessed the privilege of registering, that is, giving their consent, and with it legal efficacy, to royal ordinances for the imposition of taxes. At the same time, these bodies might be compelled to register an ordinance by a *bed of justice*, as it was called, that is, the personal intervention of the King; and the individual magistrates were subject to exile and arbitrary imprisonment, if they thwarted the views of the court. Practically, therefore, the parliaments were or were not able to act upon the government, according as this was administered by feeble or energetic princes. Hence, the domestic history of France, under Louis XV, is filled with contests between the court and the parliament, wherein sometimes the former and sometimes the latter prevailed. The *noblesse*, it should be added, were exempt from imposts; and the clergy taxed themselves in the form of voluntary grants. Some of the provinces, also, had the privilege of compounding for, or themselves assessing, their public imposts. And these, imperfect and irregular as they were at best, were the only guaranties of public freedom held by the French.

Secondly, the social organization of France. The vices

bats, 'que cette position d'observateur isolé, désintéressé, pénétrant sans malignité, sagace sans ambition, jeté dans une societé orageuse, tourbillonnante, vaine, folle, et qui marchait en aveugle à une révolution. Quiconque se fût trop identifié à elle, comme firent Anacharsis-Clootz et Thomas Payne, ne l'eût pas jugée; quiconque l'eût accablée de sa haine et de son mépris, comme fit Burke, eût été trop éloigné de son mouvement pour l'observer et la comprehender. Il fallait à la fois marcher avec elle et rester en dehors de ses étourdissemens, de ses fureurs, de ses ivresses; conserver un coup-d'œil clair, une vue nette, une âme accessible aux sentimens de liberté, aux nobles élans de la France, et un esprit assez maitre de lui pour se refuser à tous les enthousiasmes contagieux. Morris réunit ces avantages.'

of this were such as to render the Revolution inevitable, while they fully explain, if they do not justify, its excesses and horrors. Of these, the greatest, and that which, above all other things, served to hurry on the march of political change, was the division of the nation into noble and *roturier*, and the extraordinary burdens imposed on the latter, and the still more extraordinary prescriptive rights and immunities enjoyed by the privileged class. The ground, on which this distinction rested, was that, in the outset, the nobles came in as the conquerors of the country, and thus acquired absolute control of the lives and possessions of the conquered; and that, if, in the lapse of time, circumstances were changed and the wealth and intelligence of the *tiers-état* entitled them to some consideration, yet still the *noblesse* were the hereditary defenders of the country in war and its governors in peace, and were jointly entitled, therefore, to be maintained themselves, and to defray the public charges, at the expense of the *tiers-état*. Nobility, in France, descended to all the members of a family: it was a quality of blood, not a political institution transmitted by descent to the eldest son, as in England. Not only were the nobles exempt from taxation, but to them belonged exclusively all important stations in the church, army, court, parliament, and in diplomacy. Unjust and pernicious as these distinctions were, they yielded in enormity to the feudal dues exacted from the peasantry by the proprietors of land, consisting of game-privileges tyrannical beyond measure, labor on roads, the necessity of employing the mills, wine-presses, and ovens of the lord, grievances in the administration of justice, — in short, a thousand relics of the Frankish conquerors of Gaul.

In running the eye over the population of France, therefore, first might be seen the great nobles about the court, who ruled in the provinces and commanded in the armies, and of course lived upon the public revenues wrung from the industry of the people. Next were the *noblesse de la*

robe, the judicial functionaries, who bought their officers, and too often made a traffic of the justice, which they had purchased the right to sell. Then came the farmers of the revenue, who accumulated great fortunes out of the defective systems of fiscal administration. Finally there was another division of the *noblesse de l'epée*, namely, the territorial barons, who, if they resided on their estates, yet oppressed the peasantry by the enforcement of their intolerable feudal rights. Such, — divided among themselves, jealous of each other, the *parvenus* of the robe or finance looking with envious eyes upon the old historical houses of the nation, and the latter regarding with undissembled contempt the upstart rank, — were the *noblesse*, who, with the clergy, constituted two privileged Estates of the Kingdom.

What remained for the Third Estate, that is, the great body of the population of the country? The privilege of paying imposts to the King, tithes to the clergy, and a long list of feudal services to their immediate lords, while, banished from all the great paths to fame and honor;—doomed to toil and starve for the gratification of the titled few, and to bear all the burdens of the state, although possessed of but one poor third of the soil of France.

Upon the laboring classes among the people, the consequences of this were altogether deplorable. Since that time, the population of France, in spite of the constant drain of the wars of the Revolution, has risen from twenty millions to thirty; and yet the economical resources of the country, as it was then governed, were wholly inadequate to maintain the smaller number in ease and competency. Thus it was that, in the country as well as the cities, a vast number of destitute poor existed, ignorant, and depressed by bad laws, full of hatred for the men and institutions that oppressed them and capable of being excited and roused by circumstances into the phrensy of revolutionary madness.

Yet genius, ambition, the love of distinction and usefulness, belong to no rank or condition in life. Debarred of

political power, the men of the people, nevertheless, had the power to think, to speak, and to write. Circumstances in the condition of the privileged orders favored the progress of liberal opinion. All the great benefices in the church, the bishoprics, abbacies, and rich priorics, fell to the share of the nobles; and thus a numerous body of the clergy, condemned to parochial duties and to poverty, was by its origin and its position the natural ally of the people. And the upper aristocracy itself cooperated in accomplishing its own downfal. Brave, martial, skilled in war, all this the great nobles undoubtedly were; but in time of peace, and in those situations where they came in contact with the people, the intrigues and frivolities of a courtlife degraded them in the public estimation, and rendered them generally incapable of meeting any great national crisis with honor, and still less of appreciating the spirit of the times. Indeed, so far were they from seeing the coming storm, that an ostentation of free inquiry, of liberal politics, among certain portions of the *noblesse*, conspired with the speculations of the popular writers of the eighteenth century, the Voltaires, Rousseaus, Diderots, D'Alemberts, and the school of the *Encyclopédie*, to prepare the public mind for the Revolution.

Louis XVI ascended the throne under great disadvantages. The royal finances were in a state of deplorable derangement and confusion. Public opinion had already begun to control the affairs of the Kingdom. The parliaments were obstinate and refractory. A spirit of change, allied, unhappily for the country, with a spirit of irreligion, had possession of all minds. Nor was the young King indisposed to remedy those public evils, which cried so loudly for reform. But unfortunately for himself, although pure, and honest, and regardful of the public necessities, Louis XVI possessed none of the qualities of a great man suited to regenerate the deranged or exhausted forces of the Kingdom. He was ignorant and incapable of affairs, irresolute, without decision of character, or perseverance of purpose,

alike unable either steadily to guide the progress of change, or boldly to arrest it by a vigorous organization of all the elements of resistance, of which enough abounded in the Kingdom.

Disgusted with the dissolute manners of his grandfather's court, Louis XVI chose for his chief minister the Comte de Maurepas, an old courtier, who owed his advancement on this occasion to the supposed firmness and wisdom of his resistance, in past times, to the authority of one of the mistresses of Louis XV. But Maurepas had gathered wisdom from retirement. He returned to power with a determination to keep it,—whether by sacrificing to the courtiers or the people was immaterial to him, so that he remained in office. Having the choice of the great functionaries of government, he began by selecting individuals in the popular interest; and when he found that they were endangering his influence with the King or the nobles about the throne, he dismissed them to supply their place with courtiers; and thus, by giving alternate ascendancy to each, he aggravated the power of the nobles to do mischief, without affording the reform-party means to introduce those gradual reforms, which, if honestly persevered in, might have anticipated, or at least for a long time deferred, the day of revolution.

Maurepas appointed to responsible offices in the government Turgot, Malesherbes, and Neckar, men, who, if heartily supported by the court, might have rescued the monarchy from destruction and the nation from years of violence and suffering. Malesherbes would have purified the courts of justice, restored liberty of conscience and of the press, abolished torture, and suppressed *lettres de-cachet*, thus conferring personal security on the French. The capacious mind of Turgot aimed at still higher objects of reform. He proposed to deliver the country from the iniquitous bonds, which, imposed on the people in barbarous times, paralyzed the industry and crippled the limbs of France. Feudal taxes and impositions, of whatever kind,

he would have abolished; and he rightly insisted on the equalization of the burdens of the state by striking down all distinctions, in that respect, between the *noblesse* and the *tiers-état*. But the innovations of Malesherbes and Turgot awakened the jealousy of Maurepas; and these justly popular ministers were accordingly displaced. 'It is only Turgot and I,' said the well intentioned King on this occasion, 'who love the people.' Indeed, the strong leaning of Louis towards administrative reforms gained a place in the popular ballads, which Selden says are better indices of the complexion of the times than more solid things.

Le roi se croyant un abus,
Ne voudra plus l'être,—

said a *refrain* of the day.

Neckar, without attempting to effect the extensive changes proposed by Turgot, yet caused the government to rally a little by introducing economy and order into the administration of the finances, so as to gain the confidence of the monied men and to procure loans on reasonable terms, if he could not augment the gross amount of public revenue. Two of his measures at this time had an important bearing on the Revolution:—one, calling in the aid of the provincial States to assess the imposts, and the other, rendering public the famous *Compte Rendu*, or statement of the financial condition and resources of the Kingdom. But the courtiers had as little relish for a minister, who promoted change in detail by introducing economy and publicity in treasury-matters, as for one who openly aimed towards general melioration; and therefore Neckar was compelled to retreat. Soon afterwards, the Comte de Maurepas died; and the King, always vacillating, incapable, and irresolute, gave himself up to the influence of the court-party headed by the young Queen, Marie Antoinette.

Anterior to this, however, a new moral force had made itself to be felt in France and in Europe. On the other side of the Atlantic, scattered along the eastern shore of North

America from the Bay of Fundy to the Gulf of Mexico, were some dozen British Colonies, the refuge and abiding place of those principles of civil and religious freedom, which distinguished the English Revolution. Here were the Puritans and Republicans of 1642, nourishing, under the hardy sky of New England, the seeds of independence in the boldest and purest hearts of this world's true greatness, — men, with blood 'fetched from fathers of war-proof,'— sires, who had brought 'the Man, Charles,' to the block, — and sons, steeled, by religious enthusiasm and by devotedness to high principle, to meet dangers and vicissitudes in that spirit, which builds or overturns empires. — Here were Roman Catholics persecuted at home for their persevering adherence to the forms and opinions of a faith, which time had rendered venerable, and which worked on the conscience and the imagination by its imposing rites and lofty tenets, on the convictions by its traditional grandeur.—Here were the followers of Penn and Fox, seeking in the wilds of America after free scope for doctrines of severe simplicity, as the Catholics for the gorgeous solemnities of the church of Rome. In a word,the marked sectarians and the bolder political innovators of Great Britain were united here in the one great purpose of consecrating freedom of opinion, and securing its exercise by public institutions proscribed from the principal countries of Europe. — Flourishing under laws of their own adoption, — ruled leniently, because they would not submit to be otherwise ruled, by the Metropolis, — they had gradually acquired a complete fitness for self-government. In New England, especially, the absolute right of self-government had always been asserted, practically maintained for a long period, and suspended only until occasion should offer to reclaim it once more, never again to be relinquished. The Colonies, embarked against their wishes in a controversy with the Metropolis as to points involving the question of independence,at length manfully pro-

claimed the principle of public law, that a European Colony in America is under no obligation of allegiance to the rulers of the mother-country, being held to the latter by considerations of convenience only, not of permanent duty, — a position, now come to be parcel of the fundamental law of the New World.*

France had been stripped of her chief Colonies in North America by the English, and she was not slow in lending a helping hand to the Colonies of her rival, when she saw them struggling for independence. It is due, also, to the Comte de Vergennes, — who then directed the foreign affairs of the Kingdom, — to admit, that sentiments of a higher description entered into the inducements, which led him to favor the pretensions of the United Colonies. And the invaluable historical researches of Mr Sparks vindicate his memory from the imputation, some time cast on him, of being disposed to take selfish advantage of circumstances at our expense, and thus obtain of Britain, at the close of the contest, separate stipulations in favor of France. In the literary and fashionable circles of the court, Franklin rendered the cause of America popular by the dignity and simplicity of his manners combined with the charm of his genius and good sense, and his merited philosophical reputation. Yet the French court, it is probable, did not contemplate the subject in the light wherein we now see it, — of a struggle between old pre-

* My belief on this point, as I have had occasion to express it, is this: 'I hold it to be a principle of the law of nature and nations, as claimed, practised, and maintained in all America, that a European Colony in the New World possesses at all times, and without necessity to allege the ground of *extreme* oppression, the right of separating from the Metropolis in Europe. The continued authority of the Metropolis over the Colony depends upon the will of the Colony, not the right of the Metropolis. It is vain to adduce the doctrine of indefeasible allegiance, as concluding the question. That, like the correlative liability for treason, is a point of *municipal* right only; and as the parties in a civil war do not incur the penalties of treason, so the right of in-

scription and modern reason, calculate to react, by example and precept, upon the domestic affairs of France. In the auxiliary French army or fleet were individuals of the aristocratic class, who forgot the prejudices of their rank in the spectacle of transatlantic freedom; and returned home to be the missionaries of popular right and public improvement. There was one French noble, especially, the Marquis de la Fayette, who, in the first bloom of youth, had thrown himself and his fortunes into the cause of American independence as an individual, and without waiting for the action of the royal councils, — to learn a lesson of attempered liberty here in common with Kosciuszko and Miranda, and to have his name forever afterwards associated with civil freedom in France, like that of Kosciuszko in Poland, and that of Miranda in Spanish America.

La Fayette and his friends came back to France in the very moment to sail on the flood tide of popularity, as successful soldiers and as partisans of the political reformation of the Kingdom. They found the rash, superficial, but accomplished, acute, and brilliant, Calonne, at the head of the treasury. Turgot and Neckar had been discarded as economizers and reformers; Joly de Fleury and D'Ormesson, who followed, had no merit but that of mediocrity; and

defeasible allegiance does not attach to an aggregation of emigrants in a Colony assuming independence. A sovereign, whether he be so by prescription or by constitutional compact, is entitled to the obedience of his subjects only on two grounds, namely, his physical capacity to maintain that obedience, and his physical capacity to ensure protection as the equivalent for that obedience. Neither of these corner-stones of sovereign right is to be found in the relation of either of the *great* American Colonies to its Metropolis; and although the Metropolis may have the physical capacity of enforcing obedience, yet it has not that of ensuring protection, in respect of the *smaller* Colonies.' And since our Revolution, most of the nations of Europe have successively committed themselves to the principle, that the existence, in a Colony, of an independent government, operates a dissolution of the colonial relation, even anterior to the recognition of the new State by its former Metropolis.

the court, thinking apparently that in a desperate disease a violent transitition might work some good, then bestowed the management of fiscal affairs upon the adventurous Calonne. He undertook to encourage industry by profuse expenditure; to gain the great lords by largesses, and the Queen by entertainments; and to conduct the government by a succession of tricks of juggiery and legerdemain, *tours de passe-passe*, daring expedients rendered plausible by his ingenuity and eloquence, and dazzling the eye with meretricious lustre. At first, he deceived the capitalists by his punctuality and air of method; but he soon exhausted the credit of the government; and with the same recklessness of the future, which had characterized the rest of his administration, he proposed the novel expedient of convoking an Assembly of Notables to supply the public wants. This event was emphatically the beginning of the end.

The Notables met in February 1786, at Versailles. This Assembly consisted of prominent individuals, chiefly of the privileged orders, the lay nobility and upper clergy, selected by the court; and Calonne hoped to influence them to make sacrifices, which might not be obtained from the States General, now beginning to be a topic of conversation. But when the Notables came to learn the bankrupt condition of the government, which in time of peace enjoyed a revenue of only 400 millions of francs, while the annual expenditure was 550 millions, leaving a deficit of 150 millions, Calonne was forced to retire, and Loménie de Brienne, Archbishop of Toulouse, was appointed to be his successor. But the Notables did little to relieve the necessities of the State. They *professed* a concurrence in reforms proposed by Calonne, without manifesting it by their acts; while they carried into the provinces a spirit of disaffection and complaint, which powerfully contributed to bring on the Revolution. They were among the first to raise an outcry against the misrule of ministers and the prodigality of courts, unmindful that it was their own per-

sonal privileges, which stood in the way of good government, and that nothing but prompt sacrifices on their part could avert a violent convulsion from the Kingdom. — In the Assembly of Notables, La Fayette had told them that a NATIONAL ASSEMBLY must eventually come; and if these magic words had not yet fixed themselves in the public mind, still the Notables presented to men the spectacle of a deliberative body, and led them to recur again and again to the idea of the States General.

The Notables separated, having devolved on Brienne the task of getting on as he might with the government, meeting its expenditures and yet leaving the privileged orders untouched. This was impossible. He doubted, hesitated, until the parliament of Paris had recovered from the moral influence exercised by the Notables, when it evasively refused to register the royal edict for a general territorial impost, — on the pretext that it had no right to intervene in the matter, although previously it had asserted the right for two hundred years, — but in reality through fear of the stability that such a form of taxation would give to the crown. Beds of justice and exile of the members, the usual forms of a contest between ministers and the parliament, ensued; but a pun of the Abbé Sabatier, a counsellor of parliament, gave a new direction to affairs. 'It is not *states* of account, that we want,' said he, 'but STATES GENERAL.' A single word, thus thrown out as it were at hazard, and half between jest and earnest, filled the court with dismay. Greatly as they dreaded a public bankruptcy, and miserable as were the shifts to which they had recourse to avoid it, they dreaded hardly less the convocation of the States. At the same time, it was a resource, which all men contemplated, though it had not before been audibly spoken forth in any of the authoritative public bodies. But reserve being cast off now, the States General became the universal object of hope on the one side and of apprehension on the other, throughout France.

But Brienne did not immediately yield. He attempted

one other thing first, namely, the humiliation of the refractory parliament, through the agency of the Chancellor Lamoignon. In a single day, the magistracy of France was reorganized, the political attributes of the parliament being transferred to a *cour plenière*, that is, a court of ministerial persons or dependants, — and the judicial functions in part vested in the local courts of the *baillages* or bailiwicks. But public opinion revolted against this arbitrary measure; rebellion broke out in the provinces; the *cour plenière* could not be organized; and instead of the parliament alone to contend with, Brienne had the *noblesse*, the clergy, the provincial states, and even a part of the commons. Driven to desperation at last, he promised to convoke the States General.

This body, called for by the parliament and peers of the realm, by the clergy, and especially by the States of Dauphiny, was at length summoned to meet in the beginning of May 1788. Brienne imagined he should maintain ascendancy in that body. But all orders of the Kingdom were hostile to him, — the people because he represented the court, — the privileged classes, because he sought to reestablish the public authority and credit at their expense; — and he was driven from his post, failing, not so much for want of ability, as that it was impossible to succeed. — Neckar was recalled to supply his place. The Genevese banker came into office before the full gale of national favor. After abolishing the *cour plenière*, and reinstating the parliament, his first care was to provide for the organization of the States-General. This ancient assembly, the national form of representation, had not met since 1614; and the great question now arose, — How shall it be constituted? That it must consist of the three estates, the clergy, the *noblesse*, and the commons, every body knew: But in what proportions? And in what form of action? — Thus far, it will be noted, there is no great political shock; every thing has proceeded in the usual routine of the monarchy, even to the

quarrels between the court and the parliament ; but, in this question of the States-General, lay concealed the actual Revolution.

States-General first appear in the history of France during the reign of Philippe-le-Bel. The great popular assemblies, which the conquering race brought from the wilds of Germany, the Champ-de-Mars and Champs-de-Mai, had fallen into desuetude along with the developement of the feudal system. In 1301, Philip assembled the barons of the Kingdom,— the prelates, abbots, and deputies of chapters,— the proctors and syndics of the commons, — not to obtain subsidies, but to aid him in withstanding the pretensions of the Pope. But the next year, they again met, on his requisition for subsidies to carry on the war of Flanders ; and the precedent was too valuable to be forgotten. Thenceforth, meetings of the States General occur continually, although not at fixed intervals, nor with any precise form of organization, neither the relative members of the several orders, nor the mode of deliberating, whether in one, two, or three bodies, being definitively established. In a majority of cases, they seem to have deliberated together in convention, or at least to have presented the results of joint action. The States of 1614, however, like several which preceded them, were assembled in three separate chambers. It consisted of deputies, 144 for the clergy, 130 for the *noblesse*, and 188 for the *tiers-état*. Their separation into three independent bodies led to serious differences between the orders, which enabled the parliament of Paris to interfere in their deliberations, and also subjected each to the direction of the King.*

When Louis XVI, therefore, resolved to summon the States General, the parliament, misled by its knowledge of the course of things in 1614, and regarding the subject in the narrow views of its own particular aim, and insensible to the magnitude of the crisis, proposed the States of 1614 as the model of the intended assembly. But opinion strongly

* See Mounier's Observations sur les Etats-Généraux.

and resolutely condemned this, claiming a larger representation of the *tiers-état*, and the constitution of the assembly as one integral body. Instead of positively settling these questions beforehand, at once, and by an act of authority, Neckar convoked the Notables for advice, and then, contrary to their advice, decided for a representation of the *tiers-état* equal in number to the aggregate of the other two orders, and left the mode of assembling and voting to be decided by time and fortune. This uncertainty, and this vacillation of temper in the commencement, followed by the concession made to the *tiers-état* of a double representation in the hope by their means to support the King against the aristocracy, proved to be the salvation of France.

Here we turn over a leaf, that unfolds the page of revolution. In the preparation of this crisis, the people, we see, have not intervened, at least not directly: they were spectators merely of passing events;—interested spectators, critical and speculative ones, but still spectators. It was the several privileged bodies, which precipitated the national convulsion. First, the magistracy compelled the retirement of Turgot, and the abandonment of his comprehensive policy; then, the courtiers overthrew the economical Neckar; next, Calonne was displaced by the *noblesse* and clergy of the Assembly of Notables; lastly, the magistracy again interfered to thwart Brienne. Of all this, revolution was the immediate consequence; and the circumstances, which threw the public authority into the hands of the *tiers-état*, and swept away the *noblesse* and clergy in a sea of blood, were clearly of their own seeking. 'In England,' as Mr Crowe justly observes, 'the prevailing sentiment has been to regard the French nation as if it were an individual actuated by one perverse will, and flinging itself, from pure love of mischief, into the agonies of suffering and the depths of crime.'—Absurd!—The government of Louis XVI saw the Kingdom on the brink of bankruptcy. It sought relief from the privileged orders first, and threw it-

self upon the people at last from sheer necessity. The pamphlets of Siéyes and of D'Entraigues, which electrified the nation, which taught them their rights and power, were elicited by the express invitation of the Archbishop of Toulouse. Had the King, the clergy, and the nobility of the sword and robe, deferred in good faith to the spirit of the age, — a revolution they could not have prevented, because thitherward all things irresistibly tended, — but they might have made it a peaceful one, compared with what actually did arrive. But amid their mutual criminations and insane controversies, they alternately intoxicated the nation with overwhelming draughts of liberty and power, or chafed it by frantic opposition to its cause, until the furies of popular vengeance, unchained by themselves, maddened by themselves, turned rabid upon them to rend and devour the entrails of their common country. All the great excesses of the Revolution, it will be seen, were either the reaction of one party driven to the very verge of despair by another, or the convulsive effort of the nation to sustain itself against a foreign foe. — Whatever of extravagant declamation touching the wanton wickedness of the French may have become familiar to our ears by frequent iteration in our tongue, it is but the ministerial machinery, by which public opinion in Great Britain was conciliated to the monstrous expenditures occasioned by her wars against the French Revolution.

The people! — This, then, was a name, now to be one of greatness and glory in France. The people were called upon by the rulers of the country to intervene in its affairs, when they, the hereditary and privileged lords of the land, confessedly were become incapable to conduct the government. Inattentive to the forms of election, but half conscious of the destiny opening on the nation, the Ministers left the electors as it were to themselves; and each order chose representatives in its own interest, but especially the *tiers-état*, to whom accident, — or shall we not rather say the

mysterious decrees of Providence ? — gave transcendant influence at the time. The court was divided into factions. On one side was the King, with Neckar and other liberal advisers; on the other the Queen with the Comte d'Artois. 'The King,' says Jefferson, 'had not a wish but for the good of the nation; and for that object, no personal sacrifice would ever have cost him a moment's regret; but his mind was weakness itself, his constitution timid, his judgment null, and without sufficient firmness even to stand by the faith of of his word.' His resolutions of the morning, dictated by his own sense of right and the advice of his popular counsellors, vanished in the evening at the breath of the Queen. But the very elements seemed to have declared war upon the aristocracy and the monarchy. In the summer, a storm of hail laid waste the fields; in the winter, came on a season of rigor without example in the memory of man. Destitution drove the starving peasantry to sedition, and created, of the famished city-population, the desperate instruments of democratic terror, too soon to acquire the sense of their unequalled wrongs and of their despotic dictatorship. Political clubs began to be formed, — politics, to be the business of the people. A preluding riot happened in Paris at this period, in consequence of a rumor of the intended reduction of wages by a great manufacturer of the Faubourg Saint Antoine. What rendered it important in a political point of view was the belief, founded on various cogent circumstances of proof, that the rioters were in the pay of the Duke of Orleans; within the precincts of whose city-residence of the Palais Royal, the populace of Paris were in the custom of gathering to discuss the political affairs of the Kingdom.

Ere the States convened, Morris foresaw and averred that the popular party might, if they pleased, and if the King's authority was committed in a contest with them, overturn the monarchy, while, at the same time, it was too late for him to retreat without falling into absolute contempt. The States General at length assembled in Versailles. The

King and Queen, the royal family, the Ministers, and the Deputies of the three Estates, heard mass on the 4th of May, 1789, in the church of Saint Louis, amid all the pomp of decoration, and the magnificence of ceremonial, proper to a day of great national festivity, rather than the opening scene in a mighty concussion of all the social elements of the Kingdom. On the day following, the *séance royale*, or formal opening of the States, took place. It was a spectacle overpoweringly brilliant to the eye, but nevertheless more solemn and imposing to the mind. All that was most noble, lovely, or intellectual in France was there assembled. In front of the throne were the commons in costume of plain black and short cloaks, on the right the clergy in their cassocks or purple robes, on the left the nobles, glittering in cloth of gold, and wearing the cavalier-hat and white plume of other times. Marshals of France, court ladies in all the charm of beauty and fashion, guards in picturesque ancient dresses, great officers of the household or government, completed the splendid array. As marked individuals in the popular interest entered, Neckar, the Duke of Orleans, the Deputies of Dauphiny and Provence, they were greeted with plaudits. Mirabeau, infamous for past errors or excesses, not yet the transcendant orator of the nation, was condemned to listen to hisses betokening the reprobation of his countrymen. At length came Louis and Marie Antoinette, followed by a brilliant retinue of their court. He was received with shouts of applause; and although the opening speech he made propounded no specific measures for the consideration of the assembly, yet when, in conclusion, he fervently prayed that the happiness and prosperity of the realm might render the occasion forever memorable, he ended amid the redoubled acclamations of the Estates. After this, Barentin, the Keeper of the Seals, and Neckar, delivered their ministerial addressess to the assembly; and thus passed the *overture* of the French Revolution.

On the very threshold of the Revolution, a fatal error was

committed by the government, under the influence of Neckar. Worthy, upright, honorable, anxious to promote the good of France, Neckar was neither a great man nor a statesman. He mistakenly regarded the public difficulties as financial, when they were in fact political. Trusting to time and chance, for extrication from the embarrassing question of the organization of the States, he neglected to prescribe this at the moment of convoking them; and with equal imprudence, he now omitted to lead or direct the Deputies, when the question stared all in the face, as big with the destinies of France. His speech, like that of Barentin, neither pronounced decidedly for the alleged rights of the *noblesse* and clergy, nor did it sanction the pretensions of the *tiers-état*. In truth, his opinion favored the union of the two privileged orders in one chamber, and the constitution of a legislative body analogous to the British Parliament. Misled by the popularity he enjoyed, accustomed to count upon the success of plausible half measures of compromise and temporary expediency, he was vain enough to say and believe the safety of the Kingdom was in his portfolio. Well might the Comte d'Artois then, well might Napoleon afterwards, charge on him responsibility for what ensued, although he, withal, was but one of the predestined instruments of the regeneration of France.

But in truth individuals, if they might a little retard or accelerate the progress of the nation towards free institutions, were as nothing in respect of the essence of the stupendous moral movement of that crisis. The whirlwind was unloosed: obstacles could not arrest, they might be swept away before, it. Six weeks elapsed in a memorable controversy between the orders as to the mode of deliberation. The majority of the nobles and the upper clergy insisted upon remaining each separate from the *tiers-état*: the latter pertinaciously adhered to its purpose of compelling the union of the orders and the vote by heads. They took issue upon the question of verifying the powers of the Deputies,

which those of the *tiers-état* contended should take place in their hall, and in convention of the orders. Finally, on the motion of Siéyes, the *tiers-état* for the last time invited the concurrence of the *noblesse* and clergy, — and upon the refusal of the latter, resolved themselves to be the sole representative body of the country by the name of the National Assembly. (June 17th, 1789). — By this decree the commons overpowered the privileged classes; by a second decree, assuring to itself exclusive power to levy imposts, it reduced the crown to dependance; — which measures, together, constituted a fundamental change, of course, in the political organization of the Kingdom.

At first, the court were confounded by the decisive boldness of the commons, and at a loss how to act. Neckar counselled concession. His plan was to have a *séance royale*, wherein the King should undertake to reconcile differences by authorizing the vote by poll in matters of impost, and requiring that by orders in respect of matters of privilege. The Queen and the Comte d'Artois converted the projected concession into an act of violence, which prostrated the authority of the King. On the 20th of June, the Deputies of the *tiers-état* found their hall closed, and themselves excluded from it by armed sentinels under the pretext of preparing it for the *séance royale*. Filled with indignation, they repaired to the *Jeu-de-Paume*, or Tennis Court of the palace, with their President, Bailly, at their head, and there, in the enthusiasm of awakened liberty, swore never to separate until they had given a constitution to France. On the 22nd, they were joined, in the church of Saint Louis, by a majority of the clergy; and on the 23rd the *séance royale* took place. The King entered the assembly, environed with all the circumstance of power, and was received in profound silence. Assuming the port and consequence of absolute dominion, like another Louis XIV, he declared the nullity of every thing they had done, specified certain concessions which he made for the satisfaction of the country and the

lightening of the people's burdens, and concluded with threatening to dissolve the States, and to conduct the government by himself alone, if they did not implicitly obey his commands. He retired, accompanied by the *noblesse*, but the commons kept their seats unmoved. They paused on the banks of the Rubicon. At length Mirabeau broke silence, in those accents of overpowering eloquence, which began to sway the deliberations of the Deputies. He exhorted them to hold fast by the power they had assumed. And when M. de Brézé, in the name of the King, summoned them to separate, Mirabeau again arose : — You, said he, who have neither place nor voice here, go tell your master that we are here by the power of the people, and that nothing shall drive us hence but the power of the bayonet.* — We are today what we were yesterday, tranquilly added Siéyes : let us deliberate. — This act of resistance was decisive. The King was intimidated, his moral power as head of the State was gone ; some of the nobles now joined the *tiers-état ;* and he counselled the rest to do the same ; and thus the commons became, what they had assumed to be, the Constituent Assembly of the Nation.

Repeatedly, from time to time along with these events, Jefferson and Morris urged their friends to make a compromise with the King, and forthwith establish a limited monarchy with representative institutions. Jefferson says he he pressed it upon them most strenuously, to secure what the government was now ready to yield, — freedom of the person, opinion, and writing, trial by jury, a representative legislation, annual meetings, the origination of laws, the exclusive right of taxation and appropriation, and ministerial responsibility, — and to trust to the future for improving and assuring their constitution. Morris told them it was impossible to preserve ultimately any liberty for the people, without preserving some constitutional authority to the body of nobles ; and that, change as they might, whenever

*Mirabeau, Oeuvres Oratoirés, tom i, p. 46.

France acquired stable institutions, such would be their form. — But again the aristocratic faction about the court interposed, in a way, which introduced a new power into the conduct of affairs, stimulated the enthusiasm of the patriots, and augmented the humiliation of the King.

When the States General assembled, it was in the power of the King, by assuming the direction of affairs, to give the country such a constitution as he chose. That opportunity was gone. Now, his only resource was to enter heartily into the views of the National Assembly. Instead of this, he lent himself to the plots of the Comte d'Artois for producing a counter-revolution. Paris and Versailles had declared themselves warmly in favor of the proceedings of the Deputies; and the plan was, to overcome the capitals and curb the Assembly by means of the army. Versailles was made to wear the appearance of a vast camp. Strong corps of troops were posted around Paris. All the apparel of military preparation, trains of artillery, soldiers marching and counter-marching, and especially the presence of the foreign regiments, forced upon the Assembly and the people a knowledge of what was in contemplation. The Assembly sent a deputation to the King, to remonstrate against the concentration of so large an armed force in the immediate vicinity of the representatives of the nation. Louis replied that he alone could judge of the necessities of public order: that as for the Deputies, they could transfer their sittings to Noyon or Soissons. This would have been to remove the Assembly out of the reach of popular aid from the inhabitants of a great city, and, as the troops were at that time posted, to place them between two armies. In short, the court was resolved to strike a blow. On the 11th of July, Neckar was dismissed from the ministry, and ordered to quit the Kingdom privately, and a cabinet was made up of anti-revolutionary men. These proceedings brought on the first conflict between the royal government and the population of Paris.

Early on the 12th, what had occurred at Versailles began to be known in Paris. The Maréchal de Castries gave information of it to Morris, who urged him to warn the King of his danger. Tell him, said Morris, that his army will not fight against the nation: that if he listen to violent counsels, the nation will certainly be against him; that the sword has imperceptibly fallen from his hand; and that the sovereignty of this nation is now vested in the Constituent Assembly. And so it proved. In Paris, the capitalists, from the conviction that the Assembly alone could save the Kingdom from bankruptcy, the intelligent individuals of the middle ranks from motives of patriotism, and the people because it felt the miseries of oppression, — had all embraced with enthusiasm the party of the Revolution. The tidings of the dismissal of Neckar filled the city with commotion. Crowds began to collect. More than ten thousand persons were assembled in the Palais Royal, ripe for any desperate act. Camille Desmoulins, at this period merely a popular orator of the Palais Royal, ascended the ready tribune of a table, and raised the cry, — 'To arms!' — Instantly green leaves are converted into temporary cockades as the means of mutual recognition, and the multitude parades the streets, preceded by the busts of Neckar and Orleans. Driving before them the gendarmerie and a detachment of troops, the people at length gain the Place Louis XV, where they are attacked by the Prince de Lambese at the head of a party of the foreign dragoons, who charge up and down the avenues of the Tuileries. On this occasion the bearer of one of the busts, and a soldier of the French Guards, were slain; theirs being the first blood shed in the Revolution. Hereupon insurrection pervaded the city and the faubourgs; and in conflicts which ensued, the French Guards taking the side of the people against the Swiss and German mercenaries, settled the matter in favor of the Parisians.

During the evening, some of the electors met at the Hotel-de-Ville, and formed themselves into a permanent

Committee, for the purpose of guiding the insurrection, so far as they might, that it should not degenerate into mere popular license. This was the foundation of that structure of civic power, which, in governing Paris, for so long time governed France. At the outset, of course, their commands were imperfectly obeyed : — they were unable even to prevent bands of *brigands* from setting fire to the city-barriers, and availing themselves of moments of civil confusion for purposes of plunder. But the next day (July 13th,) things assumed a more regular train. Amid some few attempts at outrage on property, which were speedily suppressed, the great aim of all was military organization. Such arms, as the shops of the city furnished, were put in requisition immediately; fifty thousand pikes were forged and distributed ; the Hotel des Invalides was forced, and twenty eight thousand muskets were taken from its stores; and with the characteristic promptitude of the French, a body of forty eight thousand patriot-troops was formed in a few hours, to become famous through all the Revolution as the National Guard of Paris.

In these movements, there was no purpose of attack upon the King or the troops : the object had been defence. It was the spontaneous arming of the people for self-protection against apprehended attack on the part of the King. Cannon were posted at all the defensible parts of the city, in pursuance of the same idea. In a word, civil war, the assault of Paris by the troops, was what the citizens universally expected. At length, on the 14th, a rumor gained currency that the cannon of the Bastille were pointed upon the great thoroughfare of the Rue Saint Antoine, which they commanded. This report fastened public attention upon a fortress, universally odious as the state-prison where so many victims of royal resentment or apprehension had been immured, and mixed up in the memory with every thing that was infamous and tyrannical in the exercise of arbitrary power. All at once, the tide of popular vengeance rolled

thitherward as if a single master-idea filled every mind in Paris. The crowd summoned Delaunay, the Governor, to surrender the fortress; upon his refusal, they invested it in regular siege; though possessed only of muskets, pikes, and sabres, they determined to carry it by assault; two of their number, Elie and Hulin, advanced and struck down the chain of the outer draw bridge with axes; and the multitude rushed in upon the inner defences. After several hours passed in persevering, but ineffectual, attempts to carry these by storm, and to scale the walls under the fire of the garrison, a body of the Guards come up with cannon. This decided the contest. The people gained possession of the fortress, slew Delaunay and some persons of the garrison, set free the prisoners, and marched in triumph to the Hotel de Ville there to deposit the keys of the Bastille as the symbol and pledge of recovered national freedom. One other act of blood stained their triumph. De Flesselles, the *prévôt des marchands*, detected in correspondence with the Governor of the Bastille while pretending to be the friend of the people, fell a victim to his ill-judged treachery. Night descended upon this day of victory, amid the universal arming and watchfulness of the citizens, and the raising of barricades in the streets in hourly expectation of an attack on Paris.

Pending these extraordinary events, what had been the situation of things at Versailles? — The tidings of Neckar's dismissal had, in the first place, produced union of action in the Assembly between the nobles and the commoners; — for all joined in pointedly condemning the proceedure of the King. When the agitation of Paris began to be known, the Assembly felt that it behoved them to act with decision and energy. They also prepared to sustain themselves against the court. Apprehensive lest their hall should be closed on them during the night, they established themselves in permanent session night and day, and so continued for several successive days, amid constant inquietude and perpetually oc-

curring alarms. Their fears were well founded. The Assembly was to have been dissolved by force, and the troops marched upon Paris. But the irresolute monarch recoiled at the prospect before him, or perhaps became satisfied that disaffection prevailed in the army. At any rate, nothing had been done, when the news of the storming of the Bastille, and of the universal arming of the Parisians, reached Versailles, and satisfied the Assembly that the cause of the people was safe. The Duc de Liancourt undertook to give the King a true account of the state of things in Paris. After hearing him, the King broke a long silence with the words: 'This is a revolt.'—'No sire,' replied the Duke: 'it is a REVOLUTION.'—Early the next day, Louis announced his intention to appear in the Assembly, and assure it of his pacific intentions. He did so, no longer surrounded with pomp, nor received with enthusiasm. Confiding himself to the fidelity and affection of the nation, he had given orders, he said, for the withdrawal of the troops from Paris and Versailles, and committed himself to the direction of the Assembly.

To complete the popular triumph, it was arranged that Louis should present himself to the Parisians, publicly to signify his concurrence in the new order of things. A numerous deputation of members of the Assembly preceded him to prepare for his reception. Bailly was elected mayor of Paris, La Fayette commander of the National Guard. On the 17th, Louis repaired to Paris, and traversed the ranks of the National Guards from the Place Louis XV to the Hotel de Ville, amid cries of *Vive la Nation!* — At the Hotel de Ville he received from the hands of Bailly the tricolored cockade,—the union of blue, red, and white;—which the victors of the Bastille had finally assumed as the badge of the Revolution, and returned to Versailles a humbled and broken spirited man. Neckar, at the same time, was reinstated in office, being conducted in a kind of ovation, from Bâle to Paris. The Comte d'Artois, the Polignacs, and others

of the court-faction, who had brought the King to this straight, meanly abandoned him and their country, in this first hour of threatening danger, and set the example of that disastrous emigration, the capital error of the titled classes. Instead of remaining to exercise their influence honorably at home as a counterpoise to the excessive preponderance of the popular party, they formed the nucleus of a foreign conspiracy against France, as disgraceful to them as it was injurious to their immediate interests, and fruitful of bloodshed to all Europe.

It was easy to conceive how important were the consequences of the 4th of July. Every where the people armed, in imitation of their brethren in Paris. Municipalities were instituted in place of the previous forms of city-government. In Paris, they discovered the fatal facility of applying the lamp-cords of the streets to the purpose of inflicting extemporaneous punishment upon odious individuals, Foulon, named Intendant of the Finance when Neckar was dismissed, and his nephew Barthier, being sacrificed in this way by the people. In the provinces the burning *châteaux* of the nobles, and occasional massacres in imitation of those of the capital, marked the intoxication of unaccustomed power, the first resentful impulse of men suddenly possessed of means to avenge long ages of injustice, and unconsciously acquiring the terrible thirst of blood. — While such was the state of things in the country, a corresponding change came over the Assembly. They had discussed, with long and bitter war of words, a proposed declaration of the general rights of man, previous to the assault of the Bastille; they now gave a practical illustration of the progress of liberal opinions. On the 4th of August the *noblesse* came forward to renounce their exclusive privileges of whatever description; those of the clergy, the corporate bodies, and the provinces were swept away at the same time; and in one night all Frenchmen became free and equal before the law. In short the first period of the Rev-

olution, that which transferred the national sovereignty from the hereditary or privileged depositaries of power to the people, was now complete; and the nation was ready to enter upon the second period, that of the power of the middling class of the country, and of monarchy remodelled under the Constitution.

The Constituent Assembly advanced in earnest to the task of creating a new State. We have said little, thus far, of the composition of that body: it is time we should explain it. The States General consisted of 293 deputies of the clergy, 270 of the nobles, and 565 of the commons, in all 1128 persons, which became reduced to 648 after the union of the Estates in the National Assembly. Among the commoners, members of the legal profession were the most numerous class, most intelligent, and most conspicuous. Of those nobles, who cordially entered into the Assembly, some were old historic names of the land, such as La Fayette, La Rochefoucault, Clermont Tonnerre, Crillon, and Montmorency, — beside the Duke of Orleans, who acted against the court in views of selfish ambition, with slight tincture of patriotism or honor. It was an assembly, where the adventurous, ardent, reckless, ambitious men of the day could not fail of a field fitted for their genius. Parties, at this period, without being so widely sundered as in the sequel, were yet sufficiently distinguishable. Certain of the *noblesse* and high clergy, headed by Maury and Cazalès, still clung to their prejudices, while they actively participated in the debates of the Assembly. Neckar relied on the party of Mounier, Lally-Tollendal, and other moderate friends of monarchy on the English model; but he no longer possessed a controlling influence in the Assembly; and it was not yet the season, nor was he the man, to regulate the progress of the Revolution. At the head of the party, which looked farthest into the extension of the Revolution, were Duport, Barnave, and Lameth. Finally, there were three men, who filled a preeminent space in the public eye, and who,

in a measure, directed the march of the government, — namely, Siéyes, the leading thinker, and Mirabeau, the leading debater, in the Assembly, — and La Fayette, the commander of the great civic army of France.

To these great names, men have added that of the Duke of Orleans, on account of his abandonment of his rank and station as of the blood royal, to throw himself into the current of the Revolution. Undoubtedly the great wealth he possessed was lavishly used on the populace of Paris and Versailles; but the common impression that the Revolution is to be ascribed to the largesses or intrigues of the infamous Egalité is an English prejudice. Individuals possessed temporary powers, and authority over the minds of others, at different periods of the Revolution; but they gained this only as the representatives of opinions, or agents of public impulses; the Revolution itself governed all men, and was governed by none, until it yielded itself up a willing sacrifice to the transcendant fame of Napoleon.

No, the two great ascendancies of the first years of the Revolution, were moral influences, — the genius of Mirabeau, and the patriotism of La Fayette. — Proscribed by his order, on account of vices which differed from theirs only in the disgracefulness of greater notoriety, driven from the *noblesse* to the *tiers-état* with contemptuous indifference to his admitted powers of intellect, — Mirabeau paid back their scorn with ten fold bitterness, and avenged their persecution in contributing to level them to his forced plebeian position by the mighty engine of his eloquence. Possessed of extraordinary resources of mind himself, — accustomed to appropriate unscrupulously all tha the could extract from humble friends or assistants, — combining with intellectual superiority, marked physical peculiarities of voice and person, an imposing air, power and compass of voice, features impressive by their very ugliness, and yet capable of ministering to the lofty conceptions of genius, — Mirabeau soon rendered himself supreme arbiter of the deliberations of the

Constituent Assembly. — If La Fayette exerted in affairs less of the commanding influence of mere intellect, his was the not less noble authority of exalted virtue, of early fame in arms, of glorious association with the independence of America.

In the process of public reorganization, wherein the individuals we have designated were among the most prominent actors, the people went in advance of the Assembly. Paris, for instance, was divided into sections, each of which acted through a committee; and a general committee of 124 members, elected by the districts, constituted the representation of the *commune* at the Hotel de Ville, the mayor being their executive head. Like forms of municipal government obtained in the provinces, with an indefinite extension of the elective franchise, which prepared the people for the change next to come over the country, namely, the domination of a pure democracy. For several following months, the Assembly was occupied in the formation of the Constitution. The great subject of debate was, of course, to determine where to place the seat of power, and how to distribute its functions. Siéyes argued that it was for peoples to will, and kings to execute. Accordingly, a monarchy was constituted, having a single deliberative assembly invested with ample legislative power, and wholly independent of the King, except that he had a suspensive veto on its acts. The discussions on the relative power to be held by the monarch and the representatives of the people excited a lively sensation in Paris, and well nigh produced an insurrection; but the exertions of La Fayette preserved the public tranquillity. And here, as Jefferson feelingly laments, another occasion for giving such a regulated movement to the Revolution as would have prevented its excesses, was possessed and lost. If the King had continued cordially to harmonize with the Assembly, if the aristocracy had remained at their posts and frankly stood by the middling class which now had the control of affairs, all

might have gone well; and at any rate their failing to do so was the immediate cause of the total degradation of the unfortunate Louis.

Marie Antoinette never forgave the Revolution, never entered into the patriotic feelings of redeemed France. Not without reason it has been said, that, had there been no Queen, there would have been no Reign of Terror. Her energy, her firmness, was the perverseness of a haughty and petulant woman rather than the dignity of a great soul. In the pages of Burke, she is a glorious image of heroism and unmerited wrong:—impartial history must pronounce on her true character, which, such as it was, served only to force the King into fatal struggles with the people, ill-timed in every case, and the more absurd and fruitless, in that they alternated with long intervals of rational because, inevitable, acquiescence in the progress of the Revolution. Counter-revolutionary plots on the part of the court conspired with the destitution and jealousy of the populace of Paris to produce a new crisis. Louis had refused his assent to the Declaration of Rights. A project was in agitation for causing the King to leave Versailles and take refuge with the army of the Marquis de Bouillé at Metz. Troops were assembled about Versailles, ostensibly for the defensive protection of the King. The King and Queen, attended by the Dauphin and Madame Elizabeth, assisted on the 1st of October, at a splendid banquet given to the officers of the body guards and foreign regiments in the grand saloon of the Château. Amid the enthusiasm of wine and loyalty, white cockades were distributed by the ladies of the court, and vows were made, which, magnified, perhaps in the report, roused the tempest of popular wrath in Paris. Insurrection began to show itself on the 4th. It originated in absolute want of food: it assumed the form of a political movement, because the populace, as usual, imputed their distresses to the incompetency of the government, and looked thither for a tangible object of complaint and resentment. A young woman

entered a guard-house, and seizing a drum, ran through the streets beating it, and demanded 'bread.' A crowd of women soon gathered in his train; they rushed to the Hotel de Ville, clamoring for food and arms; presently the people rose in a body, sounded the tocsin, and raised the cry, — *To Versailles!* — *To Versailles!* — Hurried on partly by the irresistible impulse of the moment, partly, it would seem, by the promptings of the paid agents of Orleans, a motley rabble of frantic women and furious men, checked but not held in by the remonstrances of La Fayette, took the road for Versailles. Nothing could exceed the consternation excited by their appearance there in the evening. Still they presented themselves as suppliants; although such an apparition of haggard wretches in the hall of Assembly, and in the saloons of the Château, headed by Maillard, one of the volunteers of the Bastille, was well calculated to awaken alarm. In fact, an affray ensued between the soldiers of the Body Guard on the one side, and the mob on the other; but a heavy fall of rain, and the arrival of La Fayette, restored some degree of order to the environs of the Château.

La Fayette devoted the night to the duties he had undertaken. Having visited the posts entrusted to him, at five o'clock on the morning of the 5th, he retired for refreshments and brief rest, but was suddenly aroused to learn that the people had penetrated into the Château. Hastening thither he arrived in season to rescue the royal family from personal outrage. But the multitude, conscious of their present powers, demanded that the King should take up his abode at the Tuileries in the midst of them; and he was obliged to submit, and to promise he would proceed with them to Paris. Yet how should the Queen be protected from the violence of the *poissardes*, who made her the special object of their threats? — La Fayette persuaded her to accompany him to the balcony, where, in presence of the multitude, he placed his hand on his breast, and kissed that of the Queen, in token of his homage and loyalty.

They understood and obeyed the expressive language of signs, when words would have been inaudible, or disregarded if heard; and acclamations of applause filled the court of the Château.

The Constituent Assembly followed the King to Paris. Louis was now in fact a prisoner in the hands of the people, or held, rather, as a hostage to secure the fidelity of the court to the cause of the Revolution. It was the period of legal obedience, of the steady and salutary authority of the middle classes, of the popularity of La Fayette, who compelled the Duke of Orleans to accept a mission to England as a kind of honorable exile, in order to rid the Kingdom of his factious intrigues. Eighteen months ensued, in which the re-organization of the kingdom proceeded, and the changes connected with the new Constitution.

France was divided into eighty three Departments, so as to break down the ancient lines and privileges of the great Provinces, which impeded the Revolution. The Assembly had contended as it might with the financial difficulties of the country, resolving meanwhile to maintain the national credit inviolate, and supplying the necessities of government by temporary expedients. At length, it resolved to adopt the great measure of declaring national the property of the Church, and of selling it for the use of the State. Another important object was thus to be accomplished. Under the ancient *régime*, France consisted not of a population governed by uniform laws, not of *one State*, but of an aggregation of separate privileged orders or bodies. This was the pervading vice of her institutions. One great body still remained, upheld by vast riches, in which the individuals composing it possessed no property, and which they enjoyed only as a usufruct, and for the benefit of the whole nation. The clergy held their possessions by the same title, which assured absolute power to the King, separate government and legislation to the Provinces, the feudal and political privileges of the *noblesse*, — and by no oth-

ers; and why should they alone stand in the way of the regeneration of France? — Thus reasoned the Constituent Assembly in 1790; thus reasoned the Parliament of England in the time of Henry VIII, when it appropriated the estates of the Roman Church; on the same principle reasoned the British Parliament when it disfranchised half the boroughs and corporations in the United Kingdom, and thus, to be consistent, it will have to reason regarding the possessions of its own Church. The Constituent Assembly took on the State the support of the clergy: it proposed a civil constitution of the clerical order in harmony with that of the Kingdom. To realize immediate funds from the measure, a paper currency, called *assignats*, was issued charged on the proceeds of the sale of church-lands; and this device furnished the great pecuniary resource of the Revolution.

The confiscation of the estates of the Church, while it essentially served the cause of the Revolution, yet raised up against it a host of enemies. Some disaffection was also occasioned in the Provinces by the introduction of the departmental organization and judicial tribunals emanating from the people. Another necessary measure, — throwing promotion in the army open to plebeian merit, — added another wound to the irritation of the *noblesse*, which was still more aggravated by the abolition of titles, armorial bearings, and orders of knighthood. But there was little to be feared from this source. In addition to the regular bands of National Guards, enrolled and officered in that democratic forms, which obtains in our own militia, and which was to become the model of armies trained to the conquest of Europe, — in addition to these were the pikemen and cannoniers of the city-sections, all ardent, of course, in the popular cause. Nothing, indeed, could stop the onward march of the Revolution. Preparations had been made for the solemn confederation of the Nation at a splendid civic festival on the 14th of July, the anniversary of the capture of the Bastille.

The Champs-de-Mars were laid out in terraces, forming a vast amphitheatre, capable of containing four hundred thousand spectators, with an antique altar in the midst. Here the King, his family, the Assembly, the municipality of Paris, representatives from the Departments for this special object, four hundred priests clothed in white, deputies of the army, and a vast number of private individuals, met to celebrate, with religious ceremonies, the solemn federation of the French. Mass was performed by Talleyrand de Périgord, then Bishop of Autun, after which La Fayette, as Commandant General of the National Guards of France, the President and members of the Assembly, and the King, successively swore fidelity to the Constitution, to each other, to France. On this, one of the proudest days of the Revolution, rejoicings filled all Paris; and emancipated thousands celebrated the national triumph by plays, illuminations, and balls, nay, by festive assemblies on the very site of the demolished Bastille.

But new combinations of party had begun to give presage of an agitated future. The great body of representatives in the popular interest, having overcome all the privileged orders, prepared to divide among themselves. Neckar insensibly ceased to awaken fear, to exercise influence. His friends in the Assembly, Mounier and Lally-Tollendal, abandoned it in despair, because their favorite idea of the British form of government, by a double legislative body with an hereditary upper house, and a king having an absolute veto, had been repudiated by the Assembly. The mass of the people having become all powerful agents in the Revolution, the leading spirits of the Assembly sought to give direction to the popular sentiments and efforts, not merely through the medium of the press and of their own debates, but in the more popular form of clubs, especially in Paris and the large provincial cities. When the Assembly was transferred to Paris, certain of the Deputies, of strongly democratic opinions, held their sittings in the old convent

of the Jacobins, which gave its name to the association. This club gradually assumed more and more of dignity and regularity, admitting members of the Commune as associates, having affiliated clubs in the provinces, and exercising marked influence over the deliberations and measures of the Assembly. Lameth and Barnave at this time influenced the proceedings of the Jacobin Club, as La Fayette and Siéyes did that of Ninety-Eight, which maintained a moderate constitutional character. Mirabeau, courted and feared by both extremes, was admitted in each of the rival clubs; for his popularity in the Assembly rendered him independent of individuals and of parties. In the growing influence of the Jacobin Club, however, might be discerned the certain tendency of the nation towards yet more popular forms of government. Mirabeau saw this, and with his accustomed sagacity sought to place limits in season to the course of the Revolution. His relations with the King became closer; and this extraordinary man, without any sacrifice of his independence, with little care to conceal the fact, received from the court large sums of money for the purposes of his luxurious tastes, while the talents, which he had originally exerted so efficaciously to tear down and tread under foot the ancient institutions of the land, were now beginning to be employed in the task of consolidation and conservation. When at the zenith of his fame and usefulness, — the last hope of the expiring monarchy, — he died in the slow fever engendered by the overpowering excitements of his position, aggravated by settled habits of sensual indulgence, — seasonably for his own glory, prematurely for the good of France.

Meanwhile, the Comte d'Artois and his fellow emigrants wandered up and down like guilty spirits, organizing a Coalition against the independence of France; and the King himself was persuaded to assume an attitude of hostility to the nation. Arrangements were made for Louis and the royal family to fly from the Tuileries in disguise, in order to take refuge with Bouillé, and raise the

counter-revolutionary standard. In fact, they started in the night of June 20th, 1791, in the direction of Châlons, but were detected and arrested at Varennes, and brought back prisoners to Paris. The King was thereupon provisionally suspended from office, and the republican party, hitherto scarcely known to exist, now lifted its head in the Assembly. Firmly supported by the King, aided by the *noblesse* and clergy, the friends of Constitutional Monarchy could have maintained it against the partisans of the Republic; but, — abandoned or opposed by all above them, continually assailed by all below, — Bailly, La Fayette, their associates, and the institutions they had founded, were swept away by the popular impulse of the Republicans. When the States General assembled, the controversy had been, first between the third estate and the Court, then between the third estate and the other two orders, next between the Aristocrats and Constitutionalists, afterwards among the Constitutionalists themselves, and now between the Constitutionalists and Republicans. Each successive act of resistance to the progress of the Revolution had occasioned a revulsion in its favor, until one after another brought on the establishment of the Republic.

For awhile, however, the Constitutionalists manfully struggled for the existence of the monarchy. Since the flight of Louis, they had gained a powerful auxiliary in Barnave, who, as one of the commissioners for bringing the King back to Paris, had seen much of the royal family, and had come deeply to commiserate their fallen conditions. 'Powerful you are,' said he to the Assembly; 'learn to be wise, moderate, just; that will be your crowning glory.' The Assembly concurred in the views of Barnave. They restored the royal functions to Louis, decreeing, at the same time, that if he should, after swearing to the Constitution, retract his oath, — if he should make war on the nation directly or indirectly, — then he should be subject to accusation and punishment like any other Frenchman. — This de-

eree in the King's favor did not pass without violent resistanee on the part of the Republieans. The multitude rose in arms; a remonstrance against the aets of the Assembly, drawn up by Brissot, a prominent member of the municipality of Paris, was deposited for signature on the national altar of the Champ-de-Mars ; Camille Desmoulins, and another name of coming celebrity, Danton,exhorted the people to resistance, and insurrection spread through Paris. It was a perilous crisis; and nothing but the decision of La Fayette preserved the Assembly. Accompanied by Bailly, he mareheda faithful body of the National Guards to the Champ-de-Mars ; the red flag was unfurled, and the multitude suminoned in due form of law to disperse; upon their refusal, La Fayette eommanded his men to fire; they did so,. and the people fled in dismay, leaving their dead upon the very Field of Federation. This, and this alone, enabled the sinking eause of the Constitutionalists to rally for some brief space of time.

Nothing could exceed the extreme folly of the King's advisers at this period. The Assembly, at once master and slave, bewildered in the pursuit of metaphysical subtleties, new in power, engrossing all funetions,although unpraetised to exercise any, was beginning to pall upon the fickle taste of the Parisians. In the aspeet of affairs,there were flattering prospects of advantage to the King, and little apprehension of injury, had he remained quiet in the Tuileries. His flight, — a virtual abdication of the throne, — stripped him of his poor remnant of power, and struck death at the heart of the Constitution ere it became the solemn law of the land. Nevertheless, it was presented to Louis for his aceeptanee: he gave it his deliberate approbation in the presence of the Assembly, which, having thus eompleted its labors, was dissolved, September 29th, 1791, after having wrought this great political and soeial change in the institutions of France.

The Constitution was completed ; but it was from erumbling and discordant materials, that the fabrie of liberty had

been erected; and, according to the expressive illustration of Morris, like the rock spread beneath the soil of the country, it might, on exposure to the air, harden into solidity, but was quite as likely to fall and crush its builders. The Legislative Assembly, provided for by the Constitution, was convened in October of the same year. It consisted of new men altogether, the Constituent Assembly having, in a moment of uncalculating patriotism, determined that none of its members should be eligible to this first legislative body assembled under the Constitution. It was, of course, altogether revolutionary in its composition and character. Men of the people alone entered into it; for the aristocratic party had been swept away, or had voluntarily abandoned the country, pending the rule of the Constituent Assembly. At the same time, the Legislative Assembly possessed its parties corresponding to the prevalent varieties of opinion. At one extreme, were the decided Constitutionalists, who relied out of doors upon the Club of the Feuillants and bore its name. At the other extreme, were men like Chabot and Merlin, the elements of the future violently democratic party, supported in the city by the Jacobins controlled by Robespierre, who, comparatively obscure in the Constituent Assembly, was now preparing his way to empire, — and by the Club of the Cordeliers headed by Camille Desmoulins, Danton, and Fabre d'Eglantine. Associated with the last, but less revolutionary in spirit, were the Girondists, the brilliant orators of the Department of the Gironde,—Vergniaud, Guadet, Gensonné, the Provençal Isnard, Pétion, and Brissot. In addition to the marked party men there was a large number of moderate individuals, friends to the existing order of things, but not possessed of any dominant idea, nor ambitious to push the Assembly into either ultra-revolutionary or counter-revolutionary projects.

In peaceful times, the Legislative Assembly, proving the worthy successor of the Constituent, might have consol-

idated the institutions which the latter founded. But it fell upon troubled waters. In Flanders and on the Rhine, the emigrant nobles, the princes of the blood royal, headed by the Counts of Provence and Artois and the Prince de Condé, were gathering under the banners of Austria. At home, such of the clergy as refused to comply with the regulations of the Constituent Assembly, were stirring up sedition in the Departments of Calvados and La Vendée. Justly alarmed by the lowering aspect of public affairs, the Assembly adopted three decrees, — one, requiring the return to France of the Comte de Provence, the King's elder brother, — another, denouncing the assembled emigrants as treasonable conspirators, — and a third, depriving the nonjuring clergy of their salaries and placing them under accusation. The King approved the first decree, but put his veto on the two others; thus identifying himself with the seditious within, and the hostile without, the Kingdom, and of necessity forfeiting the good-will of the Assembly.

In accord with the 'self-denying ordinance' of the members of the Constituent Assembly, La Fayette and Bailly had resigned their respective offices. The Constitutionalists desired to make La Fayette Mayor of Paris, a post, which enabled its possessor to excite or prevent insurrection at will; but the Queen, exercising all the court influence against him, induced the appointment of Pétion to this all-important office, and threw the balance of power into the hands of his friends the Gironde. — They took, in consequence, the direction of affairs. Then it was that Isnard uttered the celebrated menace, which rang ominously through Europe. 'Let us tell the King,' said Isnard, 'that his interest lies in defending the Constitution; that he reigns only by the people, and for the people; that the Nation is his sovereign, and that he is subject to the law. — Let us proclaim to Europe, that the French Nation, if it draw the sword, will cast away the scabbard, never to reclaim it, but when crowned with the laurels of victory;

that if kings engage in a war against the people, we will engage the people in a war, even to death, against kings.'— 'Tell the princes of Germany,' said Vaublanc, 'that if they continue to countenance preparations directed against the French, we will carry into their country, *not* fire and sword, but liberty! It is for them to calculate what may be the consequence of this awakening of the nations!'

Bold as this language may seem, it was provoked and justified by circumstances, and it went not beyond the necessities of the crisis; since foreign invasion threatened the Kingdom on all hands. Nor was it mere 'brute thunder.' The Assembly voted the formation of three great armies, under Rochambeau, La Fayette, and Luckner; confiscations and the *assignats* gave to the government ample resources; amid the public confusion, cabinet had succeeded to cabinet, none of them invested with much substantive power; but the *sans culotte* Ministers, Dumouriez, Servan, and Roland, now appeared on the scene, the coadjutors, more than the servants, of the Assembly. Weary of fruitless negociations with Austria, they chose, rather than wait supinely until war should come, to meet the impending danger half way, and thus take advantage of the national impetuosity of the French. War was declared against the King of Hungary, — Francis not having yet been elected Emperor, — amid the acclamations of the people, (April 20th, 1792.) But the first operations of the campaign were inauspicious; and the Assembly saw itself compelled to adopt measures of extraordinary vigor to preserve the country from the last horrors of conquest by political exiles conspiring with foreign foes. Among these measures, the organization of a permanent camp of picked soldiers near Paris, the banishment of the refractory priests, and the excitation of the popular enthusiasm, had place, despite the opposition of the party of the Feuillants.

To the measures, which the Gironde, and their friends in the cabinet, deemed indispensable for the public safety,

the King refused his consent; he dismissed the *sans culotte* ministry, appointing as their successors men without credit or power; and he entered into negociations with the Coalition. Then it was that La Fayette, from his camp at Maubeuge, addressed the Assembly in his famous letter of June 16th, 1792, denouncing the faction of the Jacobins, and exhorting the Assembly to uphold the King, and maintain the Constitution. But the Gironde replied:—If the King resort to the unconstitutional means of aid from abroad, from the foreign enemies of the country, — shall we scrupulously abstain from unconstitutional means of domestic aid at the hands of the people?—The Assembly thought not; and, countenanced by them on the 20th June, the populace came down from the faubourgs, led by Santerre and Saint Hurugues, to present, in the popular interest, petitions to the Assembly and the King. They reached the Assembly, a crowd of 30,000 persons, armed with pikes, with revolutionary banners flying,—filed off in the hall for the space of three hours, shouting the revolutionary chorus of 'ça ira,'—and then proceeded to the royal palace. Here an equally extraordinary scene ensued. Louis was obliged to present himself to the multitude, and receive in person their petitions for the approval of the late decrees of the Assembly. Pressed into the recess of a window, surrounded by the infuriate rabble, bearing on his head a red liberty-cap presented to him at the end of a pike, — the descendant of Louis XIV drank to its dregs the cup of degradation. At length Pétion arrived, and exhorted the multitude to retire; which they did, after this appalling exhibition of their power, and of the powerlessness of the King. — A sublieutenant of artillery witnessed the scene from the Gardens of the Tuileries. 'The wretches!' said he to his companion; — 'the first five hundred should be cut down with grape-shot, and the rest would soon take to flight;' — and therein spoke the future master of the Revolution.

Shocked by the violation of the royal residence and in-

solent treatment of the King, La Fayette and Larochefoucault-Liancourt offered to the King a safe asylum in the midst of troops devoted to the Constitution; but, relying upon the interference of the Coalition, he refused to commit himself to the Constitutionalists. La Fayette, nevertheless, left his camp, hastened up to Paris, and presented himself at the bar of the Assembly to demand the punishment of the leaders of the 20th of June; but to no purpose. He next made trial of his influence with the National Guard, meaning, by their aid, to shut up the clubs, and disperse the Jacobins; but here he again failed; and returned to his army, stripped of the last remains of his personal influence in the affairs of the Revolution. Previous to this moment, the authority of La Fayette was immense; cabinets were born or died at his beck; but his popularity sank on the instant, the moment he came in conflict with the Revolution; showing that the most influential leaders of the period did not conduct, they only went before, this great political movement of the French.

In fact, Vergniaud, Brissot, and other prominent orators of the Gironde, loudly accused the King as the sole cause of the inaction of the troops, and as having incurred, by correspondence with the Coalition, the penalty of deposition provided by the Constitution. The Assembly, on the report of its committees, solemnly proclaimed,—'The country is in danger!'—Whereupon, all the soldiers of the National Guard were called into active service; battalions of volunteers were enrolled in the public squares; and a camp was formed at Soissons. Every day the excitement and enthusiam of the nation went on augmenting to the verge of absolute phrensy, so as to occasion, at length, the catastrophe of the 10th of August.

This great insurrection of the people was precipitated by the famous manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick, commander of the German forces coalesced against France. He marched up to the Rhine 70,000 Prussians, and 68,000 Au-

strians, Hessians and emigrant French, intending to advance upon Paris in three great divisions, from the Moselle, the Rhine, and the Netherlands. No rational pretence for the war existed, save the political changes in the interior of France, and their effect upon the possessions of some of the German princes in Alsace and Lorraine; for, indeed, the progress of domestic revolution had left to the French neither time nor taste for aggressive hostilities against Austria or Prussia. In these circumstances, the Duke of Brunswick had the inconceivable folly to proclaim that the Allies had taken up arms to put an end to anarchy in France, to arrest the attacks upon the altar and the throne. He announced that such inhabitants of towns as ventured to defend themselves, should be punished as rebels, according to the rigor of war, and their dwellings be demolished or burnt. He made the Assembly and the National Guards, and all in authority, individually responsible for any failure of respect to the King, to be judged hy military law; and if any outrage were committed on the King, he denounced on Paris the utmost extremity of martial fury, sack, pillage, and fire, in memory of the vengeance of the Coalition.

Now, the triumph of the Republicans was sure. Hitherto they were forced to contend, not only against the active opposition of the Constitutionalists, but also the passive opposition, the *vis inertiæ*, of the great body of the nation, unprepared as yet for irrevocable breach with the King. But the manifesto of the Coalition settled the existing controversy, and proved the immediate cause of the imprisonment of the royal family, and the prostration of half the thrones in Europe before the onset of the French. All, who had participated in the affairs of the Revolution, — and this included, not merely the mobs of Paris or Marseilles, but the entire middling class of the nation, and whatever was intelligent and estimable out of the ranks of the upper nobility and clergy, besides not a few of the latter, — all these were to be given up to martial law, and France to be ravaged

with fire and sword by foreign invaders, merely for exercising their inalienable right of reforming and remodelling the institutions of the Kingdom. No hope, therefore, remained for the nation, but in a desperate effort of self defence. Their pride wounded, their feelings insulted, their fears alarmed, the French rose as one man to defy and repel the mercenary armies of Prussia and Austria, and to punish the domestic traitors leagued with them for the subjugation of France.

On all hands it was now admitted that the authority of the King must cease. These two things had become irreconcileable together, — the existence of monarchy, and the independence of the nation; one of them must be sacrificed; and it was impossible to balance between the safety of a single man, and the safety of twenty millions of souls. But how should this end be accomplished? — The Gironde desired to effect it by a decree of the Assembly, — the Jacobins, by insurrection. Meanwhile, the leaders of the multitude were actively preparing to do the thing, which the Gironde were discussing how to do. Danton, Robespierre, Camille Desmoulins, Chabot, and the rest, knew that if the change were brought about in form of law, the credit of it, and the consequent control of affairs, would fall to the Gironde, and they themselves would continue in the second rank of influence. Besides, in the popular masses lay the physical energy of the nation; and it was physical energy which the times demanded, to withstand the march of the Coalition.

Late in July and August, therefore, the dethronement of the King, and the means of bringing it about, were the all engrossing topics of public interest and agitation. In the name of the Sections and the Commune of Paris, Pétion appeared at the bar of the Assembly to demand it; the Sections prepared, in the language of the day, *to resume their sovereignty*; and finally the day and the details of insurrection were deliberately and publicly arranged in the Faubourg

Saint Antoine and the Clubs. It was determined to annul the civic authorities, in order to free them from responsibility. Reliance was had by the popular leaders upon the populace of Paris, and the bands of Breton and Marseillois *Fédérés;* while the court, on the other hand, conscious of the meditated blow, depended upon the Swiss battalions and the National Guards. Finally, the 10th of August came. At midnight, the tocsin sounded, the *générale* beat, the clubs met, the populace of the faubourgs gathered in arms, and the crowd rushed to the Tuileries. At the same time an insurrectionary Committee took the place of the municipal authorities at the Hotel de Ville; and Mandat, commander of the National Guards, and known to be faithful to the King, was sent for by the Committee and shot on the steps of the Hotel-de-Ville, to be replaced by Santerre.

By day break, the insurgents were in motion. During that fearful night, the incessant clang of the tocsin, the rattling of artillery along the paved streets, the shouts and uproar of mustering thousands, filled the peaceful inhabitants with dismay. The advance guard, composed of Bretons and Marseillois, organised by Danton, ranged itself in the Place du Carrousel, with its cannon pointed against the Château; a column of 15,000 men issued from the Faubourg Saint-Antoine, and another of 5,000 from that of Saint-Marceau; as they approached, it soon appeared that they would encounter no resistance from the National Guards; and the syndic Rœderer, seeing that nothing but flight could save the King's life, came to urge him to take refuge in the hall of the Legislative Assembly. The Queen had previously undertaken to detain Pétion as a hostage, but had given him up to the demand of the Assembly; she now exhorted Louis to arm, to show the courage of a man, to defend the throne and halls of his ancestors or to die bravely on the spot. Had he done so, he might at least have made a glorious ending to a life of inglorious weakness; but the virtue of the King was that of passive rectitude under suffering, not of manly effort in

action. Silent, depressed, an object of pity indeed, but of pity closely allied to contempt, the King abandoned himself to fear, and fled, as Rœderer counselled, to throw himself for protection upon the members of the Assembly. Meanwhile, the insurgents attacked the Swiss, who remained in guard of the Château, slew them almost to a man, and took possession of the Tuileries, when they gave themselves up to the excesses naturally consequent on such a victory. Louis and his family were committed to prison in the Temple, under the care of the insurrectionary Commune, which the Assembly was compelled to legalize. And to complete the whole, a resolution was moved by Vergniaud, and unanimously carried, for the suspension of the royal authority, and the convocation of a national convention. These events were the closing scene of the Constitutional Monarchy.

We arrive, now, at the period of the great crimes of the Revolution, its mob-massacres, its wholesale judicial murders, its frantic atheism, its ferocious factions, its mad defiance alike of God and man, — crimes, which brought a terrible retribution upon their immediate perpetrators, and consigned theRevolution itself to the sway of a military dictator. The punishment of the nation grew out of its crimes, its crimes sprang from its misfortunes. Let us pause a moment to examine, and the better apprehend, the origin, progress, and fall of the Republic.

The American Revolution differed from the English Revolution of 1640 in this: — our Revolution was a contest of domestic against foreign interests, that of the English a contest between different domestic Interests. Again, the English Revolution differed from the French in this: — in England, there was civil war between hostile Interests or parties, in France there was civil war between hostile interests aggravated by foreign war called in to aid one domestic interest against its antagonist Interest.

In North America, political changes went on amid a war with foreign enemies upon our own soil; for the Tories did

not constitute a class of sufficient numbers or wealth to balance the Whigs, the party of the country and of independence. Of course, little of domestic concussion, or of that peculiar bitterness of spirit which belongs to civil war, made its appearance in the course of our Revolution. Yet even here, united as we were, measures of rigor against the Tories were deemed necessary ; as the exile of so many of them, the prosecution of others, and the confiscation of their estates, may sufficiently attest. — For the same reason, here, there was little of the uncontrollable agitation of a people, who witness daily examples of treason or conspiracy among their rulers, who know not whom to trust, and who are perpetually roused into phrensy by overwhelming public calamities occasioned by open acts of treachery to the cause of their country. Yet, again, even we can realize what excitement such acts in such circumstances must create, by remembering the tremendous shock felt by the people of the Colonies on learning the treason of Arnold. Suppose, ardently as the nation felt on the subject of its independence, resolved as it was to be free at all hazards, there had been many Benedict Arnolds, instead of but one : — might not even our fathers, moral and austere as our national character was and is, have been betrayed into acts of blood, into great public crimes, to stain and degrade an otherwise glorious Revolution ?

While, therefore, we owe so much, in this respect, to the moral purity of our fathers, to their deep religious feeling, the opposite of the fashionable sentiment of the French in 1789, — we owe not a little to the good fortune that our Revolution was in no sort a shock of *domestic* interests. Is this doubted ? Is it denied ? — Look, then, to the conduct of our forefathers themselves in the English Revolution, — to those very Puritans, who gave to us whatever is most to be honored and admired in the traditional reputation of the British Colonies. There you will find no want of peasantry sacking the castles of their lords, of confiscated estates

brought under the revolutionary hammer, of ejected clergy persecuted and impoverished, of regicide judges dipping the nation in the blood of royalty, or of military chieftains trampling on the laws. For, in England, the contest being between domestic interests, such things could not but be; — and the French Revolution exceeded the English in these respects, chiefly because the evils of the English and American Revolutions were combined in the case of France.

It is a fashion, derived to us from English party-politics, to talk of the peculiar ferocity of the French, as illustrated in the massacres of the Saint Barthélemi and of the Reign of Terror. We forget that judicial murders and fierce civil wars are peculiarly abundant in the history of the United Kingdom. As to Scotland and Ireland, this will be admitted at once; and a little reflection will satisfy us it is the same in England. No domestic war in France ever equalled in atrocity that of the Roses in England. Except during the Revolution and under special laws, prosecutions for political offences have been so rare in France, that the great difficulty in trying the ex-ministers of Charles X, after the Three Days, was to find any satisfactory precedents in the laws or practice of the Kingdom. No such difficulty could have occurred in England. — And how many princes of the blood royal of Plantagenet, Tudor, and Stuart, have perished by massacre or judicial murder in all ages! — How many thousands of English were crushed under the march of religious or political change in the comparatively modern reigns of the Tudors and Stuarts! — Even so many of England's noblest and fairest, the ornaments of their sex,—King Henry's beautiful wives, the Greys, Mary Stuart, died in prison or on the scaffold, not less deserving of sympathy and lamentation than Marie Antoinette or Elisabeth of France! Froissart and Philippe de Comines tell us, indeed, expressly, what estimation for cruelty the Islanders had acquired on the Continent; testimonies of which continually recur in the popular and religious literature of Italy and Spain.

England is the land of our fathers; her language and her literature are also ours; but here, on this side of the Atlantic, *we* may weigh the faults of the nations of Europe in the scales of impartial justice. Doing so, we shall find that bad passions are the peculiar traits of no age nor country, but common to all in like circumstances; that the crimes of nations are generally the fruit of their misfortunes, not the result of any marvellous and incredible proclivity of men to be guilty and wretched; and that such was emphatically the case in the history of the French Republic.

The Revolution commenced in the resistance of the privileged bodies,—the nobles, clergy, and parliaments,—to the financial measures of the King's Ministers. It was, in the outset, a kind of family quarrel between the titled classes. The middle class,—represented by the *tiers état*,—called in as umpires of the quarrel, seized on the opportunity, as of right and reason they should, to obtain a free constitution for their country. Such a change could be accomplished only by the sacrifice of the privileged few, to wit,—the royal family as the hereditary possessors of the national force,—the clergy of the sword and robe, as the possessors of the soil and of the administrative authority of the nation. *Ought* those interests to have been yielded up for the public good?—All are agreed that they ought; and that, by seasonably and peaceably yielding, the aristocracy and the royal family might have saved their country from the bloodshed of the Revolution. Instead of choosing the nobler and wiser part, they saw fit, in the defence of their privileges, to plunge the nation into civil war, to abandon their post as the hereditary conservators of the monarchy, and to bring in the foreign foe upon their distracted country. And in these facts, we have the key to all the misfortunes and crimes of the Revolution.

Much has been said of the inexperience of the French in political affairs, of their fickle and mercurial temperament, of the deistical and levelling spirit infused into them

by the sophists of the reign of Louis XV. These are considerations lying at the surface. — The two capital misfortunes of the Revolution, were the emigration of the nobles, and its quarrel with the clergy ; and a few words concerning each will fitly introduce us to the great achievements and the great excesses of the Republic.

First, the emigration. Had the nobles remained in France, they might, in two ways, have arrested the progress of the Revolution. Probably they could have done it by peaceable means, by uniting with the middle class to maintain the Constitution, and prevent the public assemblies from flooding the land in the torrent of atheism and mob-rapacity. Certainly they might have done it by standing ready to enter, in the last resort, upon a purely civil war. So many armed nobles, appealing to the interests of the rich and the hereditary good-will of their feudal tenantry, would infallibly have proved too strong for the *enragés* of the Revolution, as the success of La Fayette in dispersing the rioters of the Champ-de-Mars,and the war of La Vendée, clearly proved. By leaguing themselves with foreign invaders, the nobles made themselves justly odious to the nation, and placed in the hands of the democratic party such a weapon of reproach, as no other conceivable or possible circumstances could furnish. The Coalition rendered the cause of democracy and of national independence identical; it drove the King from his throne ; it threw all power into the gripe of the Jacobins; it compelled these last to have recourse to the most desperate measures for calling out the physical energies of the people, and rescuing it from conquest by the Prussians and Austrians. Thus it was the emigration, which first tore away from France all the conservative ingredients of society, and then by foreign invasion compressed together the rest of the nation into that state of irresistible, but frantic and convulsive, energy, which distinguished the times of the Convention.

Secondly, the clergy. — It was inevitable that the con-

stitution of the clerical body, in France, should undergo a change as well as that of the other privileged classes. In all those countries, where the Reformation established itself, such as England, Scotland, Holland, the transfer of the estates of the Church to the State was the regular consequence. In Catholic countries, both before and since the Reformation, it was the same, when any partial religious reformation had place ; as in France, Spain, Italy, and Germany, upon the suppression of the military monastic orders, and in the same countries more recently, upon the suppression of any of the purely religious monastic orders. But for the peculiar misfortune of the invasion of the country by the emigrants and the Coalition, the changes, introduced into the constitution of the Church by the Constituent Assembly, would have been a true reformation, not an overthrow, of the religious institutions of the country. Whatever disaffection, well or ill-founded, this might have occasioned among the titled or untitled clergy, the Assembly could have patiently met and gradually subdued, in peaceful times. But when the Coalition were hovering over the country, the means of ordinary use to suppress or neutralize domestic resistance to the Revolution, proved wholly insufficient. Previously, the question at issue between the reform and anti-reform parties had been the question of public liberty; now, it had become simply one of public safety. To accomplish this, to save the country from subjugation, required the enthusiasm and energy of popular masses, that is, an irregular force, susceptible of misdirection, and therefore liable to degenerate into cruelty and tyranny. The epoch of the Convention has been justly described as ' a long campaign of the Revolution against parties and against Europe.' Now, of these parties, one, unfortunately, was the clergy. The Republicans endeavored, first, to counteract the seditious and treasonable projects of the clergy, by action upon individuals of the order; next, public reprobation settled upon the whole order, when it appeared as hostile

in the general to the Revolution; and insensibly, as men's passions were roused, and the rage of civil war seized upon them, the teachers of religion, and the religion they taught, were blended together in the same common odium. Undoubtedly, there were deistical writers enow among the popular names of French literature at that time; and their opinions had gained but too much vogue; still they would have spent themselves in a narrow circle, they would never have exerted a predominaut influence in public affairs, least of all could rank atheism have grown up to be the *irreligion* of the State, but for the controversy between it and the clergy. In a word, the prostration of the Church and its ordinances at that period,— which, on the face of things, looks like mere insanity, or the diabolical fury of reprobate spirits, was a party-engine of the national contest with the clerical order, employed in a moment of desperation, efficacious at the time in saving the Republic, but the means of bringing in upon France a corruption of moral sentiment, a disregard of holy things, a looseness on the subject of religion, which the lapse of ages cannot cure. As it was the great ignominy, so was it the greater calamity, of the Revolution. Politically speaking, the Revolution worked out its own purification, because it has ended in regulated public liberty: morally speaking, it must be long ere the effects of this calamitous collision between the Revolution and the clergy will cease to be felt in France.

To return, now, to the events: — When tidings of the 10th of August reached La Fayette, in camp near Sédan, he endeavored to gain over his troops to maintain the Constitution, despite the proceedings of the Assembly. After some glimmerings of hope, he was forced to yield. He abandoned his army, intending to take shipping for America; but falling into the hands of the enemy, he was basely committed to that long imprisonment of Magdeburg and Olmutz.

La Fayette's intentions were unimpeachably honorable; but his fruitless attempt to organize a counter-revolution,

and his consequent departure from the army, left it without a head, and facilitated the march of the Prussians upon Verdun, after they had taken Longwy. If they got possession of Verdun, the road was open for them to push for Paris. 'There needs,' said Danton, 'a national convulsion to repel the enemy; the people must heave itself in a mass against the invaders; and as for domestic foes, they should be repressed by *terror!*' This Mirabeau of the mob, made Minister of Justice after the 10th of August, was for the time ruler of France. Danton, supported by the journalist Marat, by Robespierre, Collot-d'Herbois, and so forth, governed the Commune, and through that, Paris, which domineered over the Assembly. The events of 1789 substituted for the authority of the privileged orders that of the middle class; the events of 1792 substituted for the authority of the middle class that of the populace. All pecuniary restrictions on the elective franchise were abrogated, the multitude being made *active citizens* under regular pay from the State.

To prepare for the dominion of that system of terror, on which Danton reckoned for the salvation of the country, the Assembly established an extraordinary tribunal for the trial of conspirators. Affairs were tending for some terrible crisis. All the foreign ambassadors, except Morris, were quitting Paris. Domiciliary visits performed with most imposing accompaniments; the imprisonment of multitudes of the nobles or *insermented* clergy; and the enrollment of citizens in the Champ-de-Mars to be despatched in battalions to the frontiers, — filled the city with perpetual agitation. In such a moment the Commune availed itself of the popular consternation, produced on the 1st of September by the news of the taking of Verdun, to execute its terrible purpose. The city barriers were closed; the *générale* beat to arms; the tocsin rang out its dreadful peal; and a band of three hundred paid executioners were let loose upon the prisons to massacre its defenceless tenants, in order to strike terror into the hearts of the royalists by this horrible prostitution

of revolutionary justice. Between the 2nd and the 6th of September five thousand prisoners of either sex were thus murdered, by men, who performed their work as if inspired with a kind of delirious fanaticism, alive to occasional pity, yet alike insensible to remorse, to shame, to passion. All Paris looked on, while these damning crimes were doing, as it were in silent stupor. The all-potent Commune directed the massacre officially; Robespierre, Billaud-Varennes, and Collot-d'Herbois harangued the murderers; their blood-money was entered upon the records of the city; and when they had finished their savage task, — 'I do not thank you,' said Danton to them, 'as Minister of Justice; but I thank you as Minister of the Revolution.'

And the purpose of the Terrorists was answered. Armies rushed to the frontiers; Dumouriez, in command of the French troops, made head against the Prussians; Kellermann checked them at Valmy; and the Revolution was rescued from overthrow. On the 22nd of September, the Convention commenced its session, amid cries of victory, and the first triumphs of that military success, which conferred so much splendor on the Republic. For the Convention began by proclaiming the French Republic, one and indivisible; and appointing a new era, a new calendar, for France.

Yet in that Assembly were all the elements of discord, as well as the monstrous combination of detestable and lofty qualities, which constitute the 'genius of the Convention.' It comprised three parties, — the Gironde, who had ruled in the Legislative Assembly, — the Mountain, a name given to the Jacobins from their occupying the upper seats, — and the Marais, a name also of locality, applied to the indeterminate members. The Gironde and the Mountain were, from the outset, irreconcileable enemies; for the Gironde were become Republicans from the force of circumstances, being unconsciously advanced in the career of revolution beyond their convictions, — while the Mountain were fa-

natical Republicans, men who maintained that insurrection was a laudable instrument of ordinary government, who perpetrated wholesale crimes with a *sangfroid*, which sickened and shocked the ardent, but generous and pure-minded, deputies of the Gironde.

Parties in the Convention came into mutual collision, at once, on the subject of the recent massacres. The Gironde when they saw, in the ranks of the Convention, the men of September, — Danton, Robespierre, Marat, — could not restrain their indignation. Rumor already pointed to Robespierre as aiming at the dictatorship. Possessed of talents ordinary in their kind, Robespierre had exercised but slight influence over events in the early years of the Revolution. But nature had framed him for the acquisition of power in turbulent times; for that was his only passion; and he pursued it with fatal singleness of purpose, showing, by the result, how much more sure of success obstinate mediocrity is, when profoundly ambitious, sanctioned by apparent purity of political conduct, and armed with indifference to bloodshed, than the truest patriotism and the loftiest genius. Marat, the half-mad terrorist, had but one theory, and that was the merciless proscription of all enemies of the Revolution by means of a dictator appointed for that sole purpose. Louvet, Barbaroux, and Rebecqul, in behalf of the Gironde, denounced Marat and Robespierre at the tribune, and demanded their punishment; but the Convention did not sustain the accusation; and it only had the effect of making Robespierre himself more powerful; for the Mountain tacitly admitted him for their chief, after the Gironde had thus heaped upon him the responsibility of all the measures of the Jacobins.

The Gironde failed in another matter of great importance. They did not disguise their hatred of the Commune of Paris, nor their desire to rescue the Convention and the country from the tyranny of the Parisian mobs. The Jacobins imputed to them, also, a plan for transferring the seat

of government to the South, and of giving the Republic the form of a confederacy, so as, by these two expedients, to raise up, in the Departments, a political power adequate to counterbalance the influence of the capital. But the measures of the Gironde, with a view to these objects, were either ill-conceived or badly seconded; and the Commune remained in power, irritated by the attacks of the Gironde and strengthened by their ineffectiveness.

But an all-absorbing subject suspended for a while the party disputes of the Convention. Artfully reckoning upon the influence of great acts of blood in moving the passions of men, and rallying them to great efforts, the Jacobins and their adherents had resolved upon the death of the King,—no longer known by that appellation, but only as plain Louis Capet. In the Departments as well as in Paris, the popular societies called on the Convention for his trial; and accident conspired with the passions and party purposes of the time to produce his condemnation and execution.

When this matter came up for consideration in the Convention, it resolved itself into a series of questions. *Ought* Louis to be tried? *Could* he be tried? And if he could and should be tried, was the Convention the proper tribunal?—The Committee, charged with the examination of the subject, decided that the inviolability of Louis under the Constitution belonged to him in reference to acts done by him as King, not those performed by him as an individual; that his dethronement was a change of government, like the substitution of the Convention for the Legislative Assembly, not an act of punishment; that he was now subject to trial like any other Frenchman, in virtue of the laws against treason and conspiracy; and that the ends of public justice required he should be judged by the Convention, the representation for the time being of the sovereignty of the French people. One party in the Convention, while they admitted the guilt of Louis, opposed the report of the committee, on the grounds of right and of expediency,

They maintained that of right he was personally inviolable, and could not lawfully be tried; that if he could, it was no part of the commission of the Convention to do this; and that, if the Republic had any interest in the fate of Louis, it should confine itself to keeping him in prison or to banishing him from France.

The Mountain presented a different view of the subject Saint Just gave utterance to their sentiments; and he was vigorously supported by Robespierre. You cannot *try* Louis, said they to the Convention; for you are statesmen not judges; the point is not to pronounce sentence upon an individual, but to adopt a measure of public safety; besides, the King, as such, has been tried already; and he stands condemned in the very fact of the existence of the Republic; — and nothing remains but to consign him forthwith to death, in virtue of *the right of insurrection*, and as a national enemy. In these violent counsels, the Jacobins had a double purpose. They made sure of their object as to Louis, because the Gironde were driven to consent to the trial as a kind of middle proposition; and they destroyed the Gironde by thus rendering the latter accomplices in a *coup d'état*, of which the Jacobins alone could reap the advantage.

Accordingly, on the 11th of December, Louis was arraigned before the Convention, upon a great variety of charges, some of them based upon notorious facts, and others upon a quantity of treasonable papers discovered in a secret repository of the Tuileries. The answers of the King to the act of accusation compromitted his dignity, inasmuch as he denied things of which the proof was incontrovertible; — but availed nothing in his justification. His ancient minister Malesherbes, whose advice might have saved Louis from such a consummation, volunteered to defend him, aided by the advocate Desèze. Pending the trial, the Gironde, though desirous of preserving Louis, were intimidated by the imputation of royalism, and of consequence pursued a wavering inconsistent course. It was now to be decided, whether the

nation should return to the regimen of laws, or continue under the sway of revolutionary violence. In the former alternative, the Gironde would govern: in the latter the Jacobins. The Gironde proposed various expedients for evading the responsibility of either acquitting or condemning Louis; but the Jacobins marched straight to their end, with unshaken pertinacity of spirit; and they triumphed by their own violence, and the timidity of the rest of the Convention. The conduct of the Gironde in this crisis is illustrated by that of the young chieftain commemorated in the 'Fair Maid of Perth,' who committed suicide to escape the danger of death in regular combat. The Convention unanimously pronounced Louis guilty; and then proceeded to vote, by call of names, upon the question of his punishment, when it appeared that a majority of 26, in an assembly of 721 persons, were in favor of death.

Louis was conducted to the Place de la Révolution and executed, on the 21st of January, 1793, amid the silent stupefaction of all Paris. He died the victim of the crimes of others and of his own weakness. During his imprisonment and trial, his conduct had partaken of true greatness, firm, dignified, manly; and the sentiments, which he entertained, of good-will towards the French under all his sufferings, he left recorded in a touching testament addressed to the nation and to posterity. It were absurd to contend that princes may not be amenable to judgment; and in point of fact they more frequently perish in despotisms than in the commotions of a mixed monarchy. Witness the uncertain tenure of life and power, which distinguishes the history of the Roman Emperors and the Turkish Sultans; witness the assassinations of the Russian Czars. In arbitrary governments, the people go for nothing, it is true; but, in such governments, the turbulence of Prœtorians and Janissaries, or the jealousy of the titled class, avenges the wrongs of the people upon oppressive monarchs. The deliberate trial of a king, however, by the will of popular

assemblies, is a rare event, which only stands here and there at long intervals in the annals of time. Hence, when this happens, it attracts to the subject fully more of sympathy than the occasion requires. If sympathy, sentiment, compassion, were to govern our decisions herein, it would be easy to show that better men than Louis, and men less to be spared by their country, perished in the Revolution. The Convention, in overstepping the limits of their proper functions, and sentencing Louis to death, did not merely commit a crime; they committed a needless crime; a crime needless, that is, upon their own premises; since it was not necessary to the establishment or continuance of the Republic. His death was the signal for the formation of a new Coalition of the principal powers of Europe. It was, at the same time, the precursor of that Reign of Terror, during which the Revolution seemed bent, like Saturn, to devour its own children, and the scaffold took the place of a throne in the government of the French.

At first, the effect of the King's death corresponded to the expectations of the Jacobins. It rendered the nation parties to the republican cause, and hatred to royalty the watchword of the day. To excite the public enthusiasm in the name of liberty, equality, and fraternity, — to bear down the enemies of the Revolution by terror and force, — to employ insurrection as a regular instrument of conducting public affairs, — to legalize the despotism of the multitude, — such was the policy of Danton. He differed from Robespierre and Marat, in this: — Danton had recourse to the government of terror as a transitory one, the means of resisting foreign attack for the time being; but with Marat and Robespierre, it was a settled political creed; their fanaticism regarded revolutionary violence as an eligible permanent system. The Gironde, alone, hindered the plans of the Jacobins; and it now became the great object of the latter to free themselves, by whatever means, of these antagonists. In a word, the destruction of the Gironde became

the permanent order of the day with the Jacobins. They unshrinkingly adhered to this purpose, and effected it simultaneously with vigorous prosecution of war against all Europe.

For, amid all the domestic agitations of the closing months of 1792, the condition of Europe had received a shock, which did not cease to vibrate through its frame for half a century. — Heretofore, wars, commenced by governments in their own interest, had been contests of king against king. The French Revolution introduced a new series of wars, those of opinion, and of one social principle against another. 'A revolution in France,' says Napoleon, 'is always, sooner or later, followed by a revolution in Europe;' so extensive is the moral influence, so commanding the social and political position, of France. The example of the successful struggle of the French people against the exclusive power of the privileged classes, had filled the whole civilized world with anxiety, agitation, animated hope of freedom on the one side, and nervous apprehension of insurrection on the other, followed by a mustering of moral and physical forces on all hands. Great Britain and Austria, with France, were, at that time, the leading powers of Europe. Russia was beginning to be formidable in Western Europe by reason of the large share accorded to her in the partition of Poland; and Prussia had been rendered so by the Great Frederic; but neither Holland nor Spain exerted their ancient influence in the affairs of Europe. A spirit of melioration, the sign of the risen greatness of the people, and of the general diffusion of political knowledge, obtained in several of the smaller European States, and was not without influence in the larger; in some of which, reforms were introduced by princes themselves, faster than the people were prepared to appreciate and welcome the boon. At the same time, the *capacity* for war, the physical means and the economic resources needed for its prosecution, abounded in all Europe. If war came, it could not fail to embrace the Con-

tinent; nor could it fail, if it embraced the Continent, to become a struggle of extreme desperation.

As usually happens in case of war, each side blames the other for beginning it. On the French it is charged, that, in the clubs and in the Constituent Assembly, individuals uttered language of contemplated fraternization with the people of other countries; but as the government, and indeed the great body of the nation, manifested and felt a pacific temper, it is clear that a few intemperate expressions, thrown out in public assemblies, afforded no cause of war. As little did the confiscation of Avignon and the Venaissin, small possessions of the Pope in the heart of France, — which Burke, however, denounced as the indications of a determined spirit of conquest. — Yet in May 1791 occurred the Treaty of Mantua, by which Austria, Sardinia, and Spain leagued themselves to provide five armies, destined to act on their respective frontiers, in aid of 'the malcontents in France, and of the troops which had preserved their allegiance to the throne.' Then followed the Declaration of Pilnitz, made by Prussia and Austria, to the effect that they would employ their forces and invoke the cooperation of others, 'in order to put the King of France in a situation to lay the foundation of a monarchical government, conformable alike to the rights of sovereigns and the well-being of the French nation.' Though no hostilities occurred under these two agreements, yet either of them amounted to a declaration of war. And the offensive demands of Austria, superadded to her public acts, amply justified the menacing speeches of Isnard, Vaublanc, Brissot, and other members of the Legislative Assembly, and led to the formal declaration of war on the part of the French.

We have alluded, before, to the advance of the Allies, their subsequent repulse, the effect of the war upon domestic affairs, and the extension of the Coalition to Great Britain and other powers, in consequence of the dethronement of the King. Now it was that the war began to assume a

formidable aspect. Neither in the South nor in the North of Europe did men clearly see the magnitude of the danger they incurred by collision with France. They observed and dreaded the political propagandism of the French Republic; they understood the social relations of the question; but they did not comprehend its military relations. Their calculations, in this respect, had reference to the rules and means of warfare, of which they had experience; which grounds of calculation were become altogether illusory in regard to France.

In his Letter on the Genius of Napoleon's Government, Mr Walsh gives a just representation of the effect of the Revolution upon the military resources of France. The balance of power, which previously subsisted in Europe, was an equilibrium, not of counteracting national strength, but of weakness in their military constitutions. Each state was accustomed to proportion its armies to its population and pecuniary resources in the ordinary condition of diversified local interests. These interests constituted so many checks on the capacity of the government to mantain a war. By the Revolution, France rent asunder the shackles of this kind, which had previously limited her military capabilities, in common with those of the rest of Europe. Austria, Prussia, Great Britain, were moving in their accustomed orbits; France, 'loosened as it were from the political firmament,' was ready to strike into any path, at the impulsion of her new rulers. The dominion, which France might acquire, should she break the trammels of the existing civil constitutions, shake off all fiscal solicitude, and bend her energies to military affairs, had been predicted; but who could anticipate the 'distempered energy,' which the Reign of Terror communicated to the French Republic?

The Convention plunged headlong into universal war. That assembly has been likened to a colossus, which displayed a giant's will and a giant's strength, overthrowing with one hand the French monarchy and church, and with

the other pushing forward enthusiastic armies in the name of a licentious liberty, having for its auxiliaries famine, national bankruptcy, and the scaffold. So soon as the retreat of the Allies enabled the French to act on the offensive, Custine advanced to the capture of Mentz, the military key of Rhenish Germany, — while Dumouriez, after gaining the pitched battle of Jemappes (November 6th, 1792), overran the Austrian Netherlands, — and Montesquieu and Anselme took Savoy and Nice. Thus, in a few weeks, the Republic had achieved conquests, far surpassing what Louis XIV accomplished in a life-time, — chiefly by virtue of the democratic energy, which the measures of the Assembly and the Convention infused into the popular masses of the French.

Dumouriez, whose victories and successes rendered him the prominent general of the day, endeavored to save the life of Louis; and in so doing encountered the resentment of the Jacobins. Failing in this, he devised a scheme of attack on Holland, which he proposed to annex to Belgium, and by means of his army and the possession of the Netherlands, he flattered himself capable of organizing a counter-revolution in France, overturning the Jacobins, and the Republic. In fact, he marched into Holland, but met with reverses which compelled him to retreat back into Belgium.—Meanwhile the Convention had ordered the levy of 300,000 men to withstand the new Coalition, and the establishment at the same time of a permanent Revolutionary Tribunal for the trial of political offenders. The check given to Dumouriez in Holland excited all the activity of the Jacobins. They imputed it to treachery. They accused him and the Gironde as accomplices in treason against the Republic; and they conceived the atrocious design of murdering the principal Girondists in the Convention. The 10th March was fixed on for this purpose; and every thing was arranged to accomplish it; but unforeseen circumstances intervened to defeat the project.—They resumed it, so soon

as tidings came of the civil wars excited by the clergy and the royalist party in La Vendée. Hereupon the Convention adopted measures of extraordinary rigor against priests and emigrants; and the Revolutionary Tribunal commenced anew its terrible functions. Next followed the attempt of Dumouriez to restore the Constitution of 1791, his failure, and his flight into the Austrian camp, which completed the triumph of the Jacobins. As they ruled in and by terror, each great public misfortune gave them power, by affording arguments for the application of their maxims. The defection of Dumouriez produced the banishment of the Duke of Orleans and all the Bourbons, and the establishment of the Committee of Public Safety, which in effect assumed the government of the Republic. After this, the Jacobins neither kept, nor pretended or desired to keep, any terms with the Gironde.

Robespierre began by accusing Brissot, Guadet, Vergniaud, Pétion, and Gensonné, in the Convention and by name. The Gironde then united with the Marais for their common defence, and voted to send Marat before the revolutionary tribunal. Marat was acquitted and carried in triumph to the Convention, which thenceforth ceased to deliberate in freedom, being constantly bullied and threatened by the *Sans-culottes*. Once more the Gironde strove to avert their impending fate. Guadet proposed a decree annulling the authorities of Paris; and actually obtained a vote for the appointment of a committee of twelve charged to examine the conduct of the Commune. This committee caused the arrest of Hébert, secretary of the Commune; but the tumults of the mob compelled the Convention to annul it; and on the 2nd of June, the insurgent people, commanded by Henriot, but actually directed by Marat and the Commune, besieged the Tuileries, in which the Convention sat, and compelled that body to order the arrest of the leading members of the Gironde.

Part of the Girondists, however, withdrew into the De-

partments, and exercised their influence there in opposition to the Convention. The Royalists embraced the occasion, also, to raise the standard of revolt in various places; and civil war seemed to menace the destruction of the Republic. At this period it was that the heroine Charlotte Corday rid the world of the monster Marat, by stabbing him in his bath. A wonderful exaltation occupied the minds of all persons, of whatever condition or sex. At first, the victorious Mountain were taken by surprise, at the accumulation of public dangers upon the frontiers and in the Departments. Immediately after the 2nd of June, the Convention had proceeded to complete a Constitution for the Republic, wholly democratic in its principle, of course. While discussing the Constitution, the Mountain became aware of its danger, and it then gave practical proof of the efficacious energy of its principles. The Constitution, so soon as adopted, was suspended, and the revolutionary government declared to be in permanence until a general peace. Nor was this all. Decrees were past for the arrest of all suspected persons and a general levy of the people. The Republic, said Barrère, is a great city besieged: France must become one vast camp. In a short time, this was literally true. The nation was divided into prisoners and soldiers. The Republic had twelve hundred thousand men under arms at once, and the prisons became filled with thousands of the proscribed, whether Royalists or moderate Republicans. A revolutionary army, of 7000 men, overawed the Departments. A daily allowance of forty sous was made to each poor citizen, that he might have no care of his subsistence, and be free to attend the meetings of the Sections. In short, the Mountain, governing by the Committee of Public Safety, organized those extraordinary efforts at home and abroad, which have made the name of the Convention forever terrible.

First, as to foreign affairs. The Convention rendered France military, and after cutting off all hope of arrange-

ment by the execution of Louis, boldly made war on all Europe, and thus rendered the continued succession of victories a necessity of state. Out of the strong emotions of the time, it raised up a passionate sentiment of national independence and love of liberty, which impelled the whole nation as it were into the career of arms. Faction might reign at Paris, but in the camp the French thought of nothing but the honor of their country, except as the occasional defection or displacement of generals indicated some change of party in the Convention. After the fall of the Gironde, Carnot, in the bureaus of the Committee of Public Safety, organized victory for the armies of Hoche, Moreau, Pichegru, Jourdan, chiefs nominated by the Jacobins, and imbued with a congenial spirit. Rank was gained on the field of battle. Raw levies, half clad, without baggage, but filled with a boiling valor which atoned for all wants, threw themselves impetuously upon the astonished Allies, as if launched forth by some mighty engine, and taught the world a new theory of conquest. Every where, the French assumed the offensive, extending the frontiers of the Republic in the Netherlands, on the Rhine, and at the Alps.

Secondly, as to domestic affairs. In La Vendée, the Convention was completely victorious, notwithstanding the stupendous efforts of Lescure, Bonchamps, D'Elbée, Charrette, and Larochejaquelein; and at length twelve 'infernal columns' wasted the country with fire and sword, in pursuance of a decree that the male population, the houses, woods, and harvests of La Vendée, should be destroyed, and the women and children transported into the interior. The insurgent cities in other parts of France suffered the direst extremity of punishment. Lyons had been the centre of a royalist insurrection. It was taken after a desperate siege; and Collot-d'Herbois, Fouché, and Couthon were sent to demolish its buildings and butcher its inhabitants with cannon, the Committee of Public Safety declaring, through Barrère, that Lyons should cease to exist, and a new city,

to be called Ville-Affranchie, rise upon its ruins. Similar vengeance was visited upon the people of Toulon for a like cause; and Caen, Marseilles, and Bordeaux felt, although in less degree, the edge of the revolutionary axe. In Paris, the executioner was never idle. Marie Antoinette,— Bailly, Barnave, Duport, Custine,— the Duke of Orleans,— most of the great names of the Gironde, such as Vergniaud, Brissot, Gensonné, Guadet, Barbaroux, — Madame Roland, the celebrated wife of the Girondist Minister, Roland,— were among the victims of a single season. They all died firmly and nobly, in the stoicism of spirit, which belonged to the times. The boy, titular Louis XVII, perished by clandestine means in the hands of his keepers. Some of the most eminent Girondists, such as Pétion, Buzot, Condorcet, and Roland, committed suicide; seventy three of them remained in prison; and a small number awaited, in secure retreat, the end of the Reign of Terror.

In splendor of talents, in generosity of intentions, no party, of any age, ever surpassed that of the Gironde, embracing, as it did, those who combined benevolence of feeling with republican principles. They perished, illustrious in their end as in their lives, because they could not sully themselves with crimes, indispensable to their continuing in control of the Republic. Unfortunate as they were by their very virtues, their career constitutes a brilliant, but melancholy, passage in the history of the Revolution.

At this period, all the power of the government was lodged in the hands of the Committee of Public Safety and the Committee of General Security, each composed of twelve members, reeligible every three months. Robespierre ruled in the Committee of Public Safety, and through that in the Convention and in France. His immediate associates were Saint Just, Couthon, Collot-d'Herbois, and Billaud-Varennes. This Committee appointed generals, ministers, and judges; it attacked the different factions; it originated all measures; and through rep-

resentative commissioners, designated by itself, it exercised unlimited control in the armies and in the Departments. By the law of the suspected, it was despotic over the persons, by the Revolutionary Tribunal over the lives, by forced requisitions and prices over the fortunes, of the whole nation. The *loi des suspects* subjected to arrest all persons, who, either by their conduct, their relations, or their conversation, or their writings had shown themselves the partizans of tyranny or federation, or the enemies of freedom; all persons who had not discharged their debt to the country; all nobles, the husbands, wives, parents, children, brothers, sisters, or agents of emigrants, who had not incessantly manifested their devotion to the Revolution. After the enactment of this law, there was, of course, no safety, but in professing the most violent revolutionary principles. The lowest of the people, being already interested in the Revolution by the appointment of revolutionary committees for the execution of the *loi des suspects*. No less than fifty thousand of such committees, embracing half a million of men at a stipend of three francs a day, diffused the dominion of terror into every corner of France. In fine, the Committee of Public Safety was a dictatorship, more absolute than ever governed Rome in the worst days of her greatest perils or fiercest factions.

This epoch it is, which witnessed the abolition of Christian worship. The Convention began by instituting a new calendar, commencing with September 22nd, 1792, the first day of the Republic. They divided the year into twelve months, *Vendémiaire*, *Brumaire*, *Frimaire*, for the autumn, — *Nivose*, *Pluviose*, *Ventose*, for the winter, — *Germinal*, *Floréal*, *Prairial*, for the spring, — and *Messidor*, *Thermidor*, *Fructidor*, for the summer, — each of thirty days, and thus leaving five intercalary days appropriated for public festivals, and called *Sans-culottides*. Instead of weeks, the month was divided into three decades, the tenth day being designated for rest and recreation. These profane follies

were poorly redeemed by the general reformation of weights, measures, and coinage, which belongs to the same school of philosophic innovators.

Nor was the deepest darkness of this Egyptian night of the Revolution, lowering in tempests and horrors, yet come. To confer on Marat apotheosis in the Pantheon, — to erect the bust or statue of this monster in every city and village, might have passed off, as it did, like other delirations of the moment. But then came the spoliations of the royal tombs of Saint Denis, by decree of the Convention, followed by the general violation of the sepulchres and other monuments of antiquity, all over France. Remains of the heroes and patriots of past times, Du Guesclin, Turenne even, did not escape the sentence of desecration, which, harmless to the immortal great, poured eternal infamy upon the obscure heads of the base miscreants, thus revelling in their country's degradation. But the Commune of Paris, which drove the otherwise omnipotent Convention to these excesses, had in reserve a still worse ignominy to inflict on the nation and the age. Pache, Mayor of Paris, Hébert, and Chaumette, the public accuser, compelled Gobet, Bishop of Paris, to appear at the bar of the Convention, and abjure Christianity. The Sections of Paris followed the example, and after plundering the churches, prepared for the closing scene of blasphemy. A Parisian opera-girl, named Saunier, — of great beauty, but of such notorious impurity that, on occasion of some new ballet, she had required of the painter, David, to invent for her a dress more indecent than nakedness, — was selected for their purpose by Chaumette and Hébert. Clad in blue drapery, she was carried into the Convention, received the salutations of the President, and was then conducted to the cathedral of Notre Dame to be adored there as the goddess of Reason.—Religious services were universally abandoned, the churches were closed, baptisms and the burial service ceased, the marriage tie was converted into an ordinary civil engagement to be dissolved at plea-

sure, colleges, and other foundations of instruction, were suppressed, and the curse of an offended God seemed to have fallen upon the land, in the shape of universal madness frantically levelling in the dust all the bulwarks of religion, morals, and knowledge. The frightful corruption of manners which ensued, affords one of the most solemn lessons of warning recorded in history. Its consequences, at this day, are the greatest impediments to the tranquil prosperity of the French.

Robespierre himself was disgusted by these excesses, so far did they outrun even his atrocious conceptions of the Revolution. He publicly condemned and denounced them in the Convention. The men in power were now evidently resolving themselves into three new parties. Danton, with his friends Camille Desmoulins, Fabre d'Eglantine, Lacroix, and others, thought the revolutionary rule, and the dictatorship of the Committees, had lasted long enough; that the time had arrived to dissolve the Revolutionary Tribunal, empty the prisons, and return to a system of clemency, peace, and legal government. These were the *moderates* of the Mountain. On the other hand, the *Hébertistes*, the obscene faction of the Commune, Hébert, Rousin, Anacharsis Clootz, Chaumette, — were striving to push the Revolution into a deeper abyss, if deeper there were, of anarchy and atheism. Robespierre, and his coadjutors in the Committee of Public Safety, held the balance between these two extremes, and resolved on the destruction of each as alike inimical to the Republic. His credit at this time was immense: and his austere habits, his consistency of theory, his pride of character, and his courage, assured to him the direction, for the time, of the Revolution.

Standing upon his personal credit, Robespierre defended the seventy three imprisoned *Girondins*; he attacked the *Hébertistes;* he induced the Convention to retrace its downward progress, and recognize the worship of the Supreme Being. Denouncing, at the same time, the *moderates* and

the anarchists, he prepared the Convention for his object by language like this, — 'Without,' said he, 'tyrants encircle you; within, traitors conspire against you, and will continue to conspire, until crime is without hope. We must destroy the enemies of the Republic, external and internal, or perish with it. In peace, the spring of popular government is virtue: in revolution, it is at the same time virtue and terror; virtue, without which terror is fatal, — terror, without which virtue is powerless. Revolutionary government is the despotism of liberty for the salvation of the Republic.'—Such was the cool argumentation, which characterised the zenith of the Reign of Terror. None of the lofty inspiration of Mirabeau, none of the generous enthusiasm of Vergniaud, none even of the bold energy of Danton, appeared in the harangues of Robespierre. The last degree of merciless ferocity ever dwells in men of cold, saturnine, subtle make, free, it may be, from the occasional errors or infirmities of genius, but wholly destitute of its redeeming aspirations.

First, then, the Committee struck at the *Hébertistes*. They were condemned by the Revolutionary Tribunal, and speedily executed. All the rest of the victims of the Revolution, of whatever sex, condition, or party, died with dignity and self-possession, as the martyrs of opinion, whether religious or political, usually do, testifying, by their deaths, the sincerity of their faith in some dominant idea or principle. But these foul miscreants, — whose religion was atheism,—their moral code, systematised vice, — their politics, anarchy, — went to their last account as such men should, in the fearful anticipation of judgment to come. — This blow intimidated and humbled the Commune.

Next, the Committee fell upon the *Dantonistes*. Danton, Camille Desmoulins, Philipeaux, Lacroix, and Westermann, took their turn before the terrible tribunal, which themselves created. Danton was urged to forestal his enemies, by rallying the Convention to shake off the yoke of the

Committees. When he led the people to the sack of the Tuileries, his exhortation to the Legislative Assembly was,—'Pour vaincre nos ennemis, pour les atterrer, que faut il? De l'audace! Encore de l'audace! Toujour de l'audace!'*—But now, either his confidence had deserted him, or he disdained to struggle with his fate. — He and his friends died courageously, but as if amazed at the turn of fortune, and hardly able to comprehend how they, the founders of the Republic and of its system of terror, could perish on the Place de la Révolution.

Robespierre, therefore, ruled alone, or at least Robespierre and Death ruled in dread companionship. The Committee of Public Safety saw itself released, for the present, from fear either of the Commune, the Convention, or the Departments, and it bent all its energies to the task of consolidating its power. In the name of virtue, humanity, public good, it perpetrated crimes at which the world shudders. Robespierre, Saint Just, and Couthon formed a triumvirate in the Committee, powerful there by their joint influence, powerful elsewhere by their harmony of sentiment, and their uncompromising enforcement of the system of terror, and identified by the people with the very being of the Republic. They professed a desire to found a government after the manner of the ancients, simple, austere, full of probity, good sense, and fraternal feeling, with liberty and equality for its foundations. They were the Fifth-Monarchy-men of the French Revolution, in the outset governed by a single idea, sacrificing all considerations to that alone, and reconciling themselves to whatever enormities by the phrase of 'public safety,'—and driven to darker

* Did Danton take these expressions from Bacon? Or did the experience of the demagogue lead him to the same conclusion with the science of the philosopher? — 'Quid in rebus civilibus maxime prodest? Audacia. Quid secundum? Audacia. Quid tertium? Audacia.' So says Bacon. See Alison's 'History of Europe during the French Revolution,' vol. ii, p. 2.

iniquity in the sequel by the mere instinct of self-preservation. This accounts for the contradictory language of the Terrorists at different times, and the seeming discrepancy between their amiable *theophilanthropism* of principle, and their dire atrocity of conduct. Barrère was the orator of the Committee, Saint Just its man of action, Robespierre its guiding spirit, Couthon, Billaud Varennes, Callot-d'Herbois, and the rest, sectaries and apostles of the school.

Then was seen the complete concentration of public power in a few hands, the natural tendency of anarchic violence in all countries. The Committee took to itself, or to its own subordinate committtees, all the executive functions; it caused all the clubs to be shut up except that of the Jacobins, which became its sole organ in Paris and the Departments; its commissioners, of course, were absolute wherever they went; and guillotines arose on every side, to execute the stern mandates of the Committee against all the remaining illustrations of France.

In the midst of the frightful scenes of that period, — when Paris witnessed eighty executions every day, when the quarries were choked up with dead, when there needed a reservoir purposely to carry off the blood of victims, when squalid *Sans-culottes* alone lived without perpetual apprehension of the axe, — then it was that Robespierre developed his doctrine of theophilanthropism, the adoration of the Supreme Being by the simple homage of virtuous hearts and lives; and a magnificent fête was solemnized in the Champ-de-Mars, in honor of the Supreme Being, with Robespierre as *pontifex-maximus* in the style of the Romans. He was denominated the Great Man of the Republic. On the 22nd Prairial, the day after the fête, he obtained from the Convention a new decree of blood, which extended the application of the *loi des suspects*, and divided the Revolutionary Tribunal into four separate courts, so as that it might proceed with greater despatch in clearing the prisons. This new law placed the members of the Convention itself

at the merey of Robespierre. The Revolutionary Tribunal, the Parisians commanded by Henriot, the purified Commune, and the Jacobin Club, were implicitly devoted to his will. Partieular individuals signalized themselves as the instruments of his bloody dominion. Sueh was Fouquier Tinville, the publie accuser at Paris; sueh, Carrier, the author of the *noyades* of Nantes; sueh, Lebon, the proeonsular tyrant of Arras; — who seemed to wallow in gore, with a kind of demoniae phrensy. The Revolutionary Tribunal alone sent to the guillotine 18,603 vietims; Carrier destroyed 32,000 at Nantes; 31,000 perished at Lyons; in La Vendée the number of deaths by war and massacre was little short of a million; beside whieh, were the slaughters at Avignon, Toulon, Marseilles, Arras, and elsewhere in the Departments. — At length, all Franee, high and low, siekened of the Reign of Terror.

The Convention, as Robespierre well knew, regarded his power with dread, with trembling awe, and with seeret hostility only disguised by fear. His policy at all times had been, to eut off the chiefs, and to leave the multitude untouehed; the application of terror was for the former, that of republican enthusiasm and the sense of victory for the latter; and having ascended thus far, his final aim was to purify the Committees and the Convention, by removing all prominent men, not of his immediate faction. To aeeomplish this, he relied upon the Club of Jacobins, — the Commune, governed by Fleuriot and Payan, — Dumas and Coffinhal of the Revolutionary Tribunal, — and the armed popularae led by Henriot. In the Convention and Committees he had Saint-Just for his eoadjutor in this as in every thing, — Saint-Just, his disciple in politieal fanaticism, his emulator in probity and purity of life, his superior in taet, energy, firmness, in straight-forward audacity of plan and of performanee. 'DARE!' said he to Robespierre, — 'that is the seeret of revolutions.' — Meanwhile, the doomed men of the Convention, eonseious of what was in agitation, prepar-

ed for their defence by endeavoring to combine all that remained of the old hostile parties in the common cause of defence against Robespierre and Saint-Just.

After some preliminary skirmishing, the final struggle opened on the 8th Thermidor, (28th July, 1794.) — Robespierre, at the close of a bold attack on his antagonists, demanded the general purification of the two Committees, and the establishment of unity of government under the supreme authority of the Convention. Hereupon, a stormy debate ensued, in which Bourdon de l'Oise, Vadier, Cambon, Fréron, and especially Billaud-Varennes, vehemently assailed the motives and purposes of Robespierre. The next day Saint-Just resumed the debate; but was violently interrupted by Tallien and Billaud-Varennes, who declared what was the fact, that the overthrow of the Convention by force had been discussed the night before in the Club of the Jacobins. Gathering resolution from excess of danger, the President, Thuriot, drowned with his bell the voice of Robespierre whenever the latter attempted to speak, and the Convention ordered the arrest of him and his brother, and of Couthon, Lebas, and Saint-Just. — During this extraordinary scene, Saint-Just remained calm and self-collected to the last; but Robespierre became agitated and exhausted with rage and fatigue. He foamed at the mouth, his voice grew husky. — 'Wretch!' cried a voice from the Mountain, — 'you choke with the blood of Danton!'

After consigning Robespierre and his associates to different prisons, the Convention adjourned until the evening. In the interim, the Commune and the Jacobin Club mustered their forces, they rescued the prisoners, and Henriot marched his cannoniers into the Place du Carrousel. Then was the critical moment of the conspiracy. Recoiling from the part imposed on them by Henriot, the cannoniers refused to fire upon the Convention. This refusal was decisive of the day. Henriot returned to the Hotel-de-Ville, and arranged his forces in the Place de Grève, expecting

the arrival of the Sections to sustain the Commune; but the people saw in the Convention the representatives of the nation, in Robespierre and the Commune only a band of outlawed conspirators; and they abandoned the latter to destruction. The two Robespierres, Lebas, and Couthon, endeavored to commit suicide; but only Lebas succeeded. Saint Just tranquilly awaited his fate. They were executed in the Place de la Révolution the next day, — Saint-Just unmoved as usual, Robespierre ghastly and mutilated, but wearing an expression of pity, rather than resentment, towards the noisy crowd which loaded him with imprecations.

The Reign of Terror ended with the fall of Robespierre. Men seemed to draw a long breath, as if suddenly relieved from some overwhelming emotion weighing down the soul. It would have ended, also, with his success. The Revolution had reached its climax, and Robespierre knew it; for there is reason to believe that this fell tyrant, like Sulla after the proscription of the Marian faction, designed, on the destruction of his adversaries, to give regularity and repose to the Republic. Moderation would then have been the dictate alike of policy and of necessity. Such is the opinion of competent judges, on review of the whole matter; and such, it is material to remark, seems to have been the opinion of Morris and Monroe, gathered at the time from personal observation or knowledge.*

Robespierre was no more; but the Convention remained with abundant elements of discord in its bosom. On one side were the responsible members of the Committees, such as Vadier, Billaud-Varennes, Barrère, Collot-d'Herbois, and Amar; together with Carnot, Cambon, and the two Prieurs, who had been the business-men of the Committees; and such other members of the Convention, as were committed to the ultra-revolutionary system by their conduct as representative commissioners in the Departments. On the other side, were the *moderates*; such as Boissy-d'Anglas,

* Life of Morris, vol. ii, p. 419; Monroe's View, p. 11.

Sièyes, Cambacérès, and Chénier; and the remains of the Mountain, led by Tailien, Fréron, Legendre, Barras, Bourdon de l'Oise, Rovère, and the two Merlins; who formed, together, a party called *Thermidoriens*, from their immediate instrumentality in the events of Thermidor. This party constituted a fixed majority of the Convention, determined to tranquillize and consolidate the Republic. They recalled the proscribed deputies, including Isnard, Louvet, Lanjuinais, and a few others, the remnant of the brilliant Gironde. They filled up the Committees with new men. They condemned Lebon and Carrier. They denounced Billaud-Varennes, Collot-d'Herbois, Barrère, and Vadier, and prepared for the condemnation of them, and the proscription of the Jacobin Club.

The *Thermidoriens* were upheld in Paris, during these proceedings, by a peculiar force, one of the extraordinary features of the time, to wit, a troop organized by Fréron, and called the *Jeunesse Dorée*. This corps consisted of young men of the middle and upper classes, — clad *à la victime*, with open breasted jackets, low slippers, and the hair long, but gathered up in tresses, — and armed with loaded bludgeons. The bands of this fantastic militia were continually at war with those of the Jacobins, in the streets of Paris. The *Jeunesse Dorée* controlled the Palais Royal, — the Jacobins, the Garden of the Tuilerics. Finally, the Jacobins were completely beaten, the Convention closed the Club, and this redoubtable association ceased to exist. In fact, a strong reaction against the party of the Mountain was in progress. conducted by the recalled *Girondins* and their old friends in the Convention.

Billaud-Varennes, Collot d'Herbois, Barrère, and Vadier, were brought before the Convention for trial on the 3rd Germinal. The proceedings occupied several days, the accused being warmly defended by the *Crétois*, as the wreck of the Mountain was now called. Two attempts to rescue the accused were made by the men of the Faubourgs, but

repelled by those of the interior Sections and the *Troupe Dorée*; and the accused were sentenced to transportation; seventeen others of the *Crétois* being at the same time put under arrest. Famine prevailed at this time in Paris, and aggravated the fury of the hostile populace of the Faubourgs. They made one last effort for the continuance of revolutionary government. On the 1st Prairial, (May 20th, 1795,) the Faubourgs organized an insurrection, — marched down upon the Convention, demanding bread, and the ultra-democratic Constitution of ninety three, — entered the hall by force, — and drove out the members, except the President, Boissy-d'Anglas, who maintained his place in spite of them, protesting against the popular violence, — and the *Crétois*, who remained to take advantage of it. In the scuffle, one of the rabble killed the Deputy Féraud, thinking it was Fréron. The *Crétois*, who kept their places, instantly passed decrees for the reestablishment of the Jacobins, and the appointment of an executive commission of their party. But, in the meantime, the Sections mustered, expelled the insurgents from the hall, and restored the authority of the Convention. The Convention hereupon disarmed the Faubourgs, and the independent power of the populace, its direct control of the government, its public life, so to speak, drew to a close. Six of the leaders of the *Crétois*, — Goujon, Bourbotte, Rome, Duroy, Duquesnoy, and Soubrany, — were condemned to death. To anticipate execution, each stabbed himself with the same weapon, passed from one to another, and died, three of them of their wounds and three on the scaffold, with the serenity common to the great victims of the Revolution.

Down to this period, the French armies, directed by the superintending genius of Carnot, had effectually secured the independence of the Republic. They had reconquered Belgium, revolutionized and occupied Holland, compelled Prussia and Spain to conclude peace, and crossed the Alps into Italy. Under the Convention, there were no symptoms

of disaffection in the camp. The armies found themselves led to victory, and were content; and the generals, chiefly new men, possessed no political influence. So signal had been their success, that the Convention felt able to relax in its severity against the emigrants, great numbers of whom now returned to France. Joining with the disaffected, in Paris and the Departments, these individuals produced an anti-revolutionary reaction, which occasioned some bloodshed, and at length ended in an attack on the Convention.

This body sought to neutralize parties by means of a Constitution, republican in principle, and yet favorable to the middle class. The new Constitution placed the executive authority in the hands of an elective Directory of five persons, and a legislature of two chambers, named Councils, one called from its number the Council of Five Hundred, and the other, of two hundred and fifty members, the Council of Ancients. Instead of universal suffrage, they introduced a small property-qualification for voters, who chose electoral colleges, which last elected the national representatives in the Councils. Alarmed by the returning strength and courage of the Royalists, the Convention provided that, in the first elections, two thirds of the members of the two Councils should be appointed from itself, and only one third be chosen by the people; — in order thus to make sure of the continuance of republican legislators to carry into effect the new Constitution. The Sections, which, from being anti-Jacobin in the month of Prairial, had now, in the progress of reaction, come to be directed by Royalists, formed a Central Committee, and proceeded to *nullify* the Convention. But a majority of the primary assemblies having ratified the Constitution with its proviso annexed, nothing remained but for the Sections to submit, or bring the matter to the issue of arms. They chose the latter alternative. The Convention was neither unwilling nor unprepared to meet the danger. It empowered a committee of five members, Colombel, Bar-

ras, Daunou, Letourneur, and Merlin de Douai, to adopt all the requisite measures of defence. The committee employed Menou to head their forces; but, on his entering into a parley with the insurgents, he was removed; and a young officer of artillery, whom Barras had known advantageously at Toulon, was selected to take the place of Menou. This man was Napoleon Bonaparte. There was no fear of his shrinking from collision with a mob. He posted such troops as the Convention could trust, in proper positions around the Tuileries, defeated the armed Sections in fair battle, and thus preserved the charmed life of the Convention against this last effort of party-violence.

Nothing remained but to organize the new government. The Convention chose Laréveillère-Lepaux, Siéyes, Rewbell, Letourneur, and Barras, — and on Siéyes declining the trust, Carnot in his place, — to be the five Directors; — purposely selecting them from among the individuals who voted for the King's death, as a kind of pledge to all parties of their revolutionary character. Previous to resigning its mighty power, the Convention passed a decree, on the 3rd Brumaire, (October 25th, 1795,) for the formation of the National Institute of arts and sciences; and the next day, a decree abolishing the punishment of death at the conclusion of the general peace, — a second, of general oblivion for acts relative to the Revolution, — and a third, for changing the name of the Place de la Révolution to Place de la Concorde; and these were the final measures of the National Convention.

Its career of blood was ended. Its domination had been one long conflict of parties, each successively striving to establish its own policy, and each failing, because the whole social system was disorganized by domestic and foreign war, and it was impossible to give consolidation and consistency to any form of government, until the being of the Republic itself could be assured. Its three years of dictatorship, if they were lost to freedom, yet saved the Revolution.

With the establishment of the Directory, the second period of the Revolution opened. The King and the titled classes were shaken and overturned by the Constituent Assembly; the middle classes were in like manner broken by the Convention. Change, beginning at the highest rank, gradually descended to the lowest, beating up the whole mass of society from top to bottom. Men had lived many ages in a few years. Centuries of difference severed the French of 1791 from those of 1787, the French of 1794 from those of 1791,—centuries in sentiments, ideas, vicissitudes. The Constitutional Monarchy, — full of lofty principles, with its regulated liberty, its noble aspirations, its brilliant prospects, — gave place to the stormy epoch of the Republic, — when private life ceased to be, when the nation seemed alternately a popular assembly and a camp, when liberty sank into licentiousness, and when, if plumed Victory led the French army from conquest to conquest, yet Havoc and Famine trod in her train. — Each party had successively tried to establish itself, the aristocracy in 1797, the middle class in 1791, and the democracy in 1793; and each had failed, because each had been exclusive in its plans and principles. In the progress of so many political *bouleversemens*, the violent men of each party had in a great measure perished, and extreme opinions had perished also; so that nearly all were prepared to maintain, or acquiesce in, a system of moderation and conciliation. Furthermore, the movement of the French toward freedom now ceased, for the simple reason that it had reached its ultimate point, — and the movement toward civilization began, — that improvement in the useful and ornamental arts, that eminent intellectual and social cultivation, which distinguished the period of the Consulate and the Empire.

It was no common or easy task, which awaited the Directory, upon their assuming the executive functions. Nothing of the convenient routine, the official fixtures, the selfworking machinery of an old or an established govern-

ment, was at hand. Every thing was provisional and unsettled. Money of course there was none. The Committee of Public Safety had used without stint the resource of paper-currency based upon the confiscated lands. They found the government in this respect rich; but they had impoverished it in the defence of the Revolution. One half of the soil of France, domains of the crown or estates of the emigrant nobles and the beneficed clergy, had been sold, and the proceeds expended in the public service, ordinary and extraordinary. Thus, by means of confiscation affecting clerical and titled proprietors, requisitions on the commercial classes and the secondary proprietors, and fixed prices imposed by law upon the cultivators and other industrious classes, the armies and the populace had been sustained, and chiefly by the consumption of the fixed capital of the State. The deficiencies of revenue, which so hampered the government previous to the Revolution, — the imposts which parliaments refused to register because of their oppressiveness, — were but as dust in the balance compared with the great wants and operations of the Convention. The Republic did not, it is true, fall into express bankruptcy; but by the lavish issue of *assignats* in discharge of all public dues, and their monstrous depreciation in value, the national debt was insensibly melting away; and the transition to cash-payments would settle that point in a summary manner. To place the public revenues upon a stable footing, to reorganize the official mechanism of government, to cicatrize the wounds of so many years of blood, to direct the awakened energies of the people into the paths of agricultural, manufacturing, and mercantile industry, — such were the important labors devolved upon the Directory, and which they undertook with zeal, courage, and good sense.

Nor did their care stop at mere administrative duties; for both at home and abroad they infused new vigor into the operations of the government in matters out of its ordinary pacific functions. Giving the command of the West to

Hoche, they enjoined him to bring speedily to a close the war of La Vendeé and of the Chouans of Bretagne, which his vigor, activity, and prudence happily accomplished. — Scarce had the Directory announced the conclusion of this protracted civil war with the Royalists of the Bocage, when the government was threatened by the conspiracy of Graechus Babœuf, the last of the ultra-democratic chiefs of the Parisian Commune. Babœuf, and his principal coadjutor, Darthé, were condemned capitally; and their party ceased, from that time, to appear in a formidable shape. Plots of a different kind, however, began to be agitated, with a view to the restoration of the ancient government, which the success of the Directory in its foreign wars enabled it to quell and punish.

In recompense of his courage and conduct on the day of Vendémiaire, Bonaparte had been appointed to the command of the army of Italy. Pichegru having engaged in treasonable correspondence with the Bourbons, had been removed, and Moreau promoted to his place. Carnot contemplated, in the approaching campaign, the bold scheme of transferring the war to the heart of the enemy's territory; it being arranged that Jourdan from the Netherlands, Moreau from the Rhine, and Bonaparte from Italy, should each conduct his army into Germany, by concentric lines converging upon Vienna, the chief seat of the Coalition on the Continent. Owing to an error of Jourdan's this plan failed in its ultimate aim; but it gave occasion to the celebrated retreat of Moreau; and was yet more memorable as the commencement of the marvellous career of Bonaparte. This extraordinary man found a small army of 30,000 men, destitute of every thing but patriotism, courage, and military experience, awaiting him at the foot of the Alps. In front of them, were 90,000 Austrian and Sardinian troops, in three corps, under Argentau, Colli, and Beaulieu. Conducted by the genius of Bonaparte, it cost the French but fifteen days to enter Italy — again the splendid victories of Montenotte, Mille-

simo, and Mondovi, and compel Sardinia to make peace with the Republic. Pursuing his advantage, Bonaparte advanced into Lombardy, driving Beaulieu before him, gained possession of the Milanese, laid seige to Mantua preparatory to entering Austria by the Tyrol, vanquished a new army under Wurmser, and a third commanded by Alvinzi; and then crossing the Tyrolese Alps in triumph, debouched upon the plains of Germany. By this extraordinary series of victories, the Coalition was humbled and confounded; and Austria was fain to negociate the preliminaries of Leoben, followed by the treaty of Campo Formio, which recognized the French Republic, and its extended boundary.

Potent as the Directory was abroad, it was by no means securely established at home. By recent elections, the Royalists had gained a footing in the two Councils. A moderate party had also grown up there, which availed itself of plausible topics of public policy, such as freedom of the press, peace, and economy in the government-expenditures, to thwart the plans of the Directory. — At the same time, the Councils proposed or passed various decrees in favor of the emigrants, which conflicted with the opinions of Barras, Rewbell, and Laréveillère-Lepaux, who, with the directorial party in the Councils, have been aptly likened to the Rump of the Long Parliament. These three Directors entertained the purpose of *purging* the Councils, not only of the Royalists, but of prominent men of the moderate party, such as Boissy-d'Anglas, Bourdon de l'Oise, Henri-Larivière, Rovère, Barbé-Marbois, and Portalis. To accomplish this, it was necessary to seek aid from the army, which, enthusiastically devoted to the Revolution, and intoxicated with its recent victories, looked for orders to the Directory, as if the sole head of the Republic. In concert with Barras, the young conqueror of Italy procured from his army patriotic addresses against the alleged *royalism* of the Councils, of which Augereau was the bearer. Carnot, from intimate conviction of the necessity of now adhering

to legal order, — and Barthélemy, who had been placed in the Directory by the *moderates* in lieu of Letourneur, — opposed the scheme of the other Directors. Barras, however, was resolved to persevere; and on the 18th Fructidor, (September 4th, 1787,) Augereau was employed to surround the Tuileries with troops, and thus enable the directorial party in the Councils to banish from the Republic upwards of fifty of the members disagreable to the majority of the Directory. At the same time, many of the *insermented* clergy and titled nobles were yet once more put under the ban of the law. — This act of unconstitutional violence and gross usurpation set the seal to the fate of the Republic.

Bonaparte was now lording it in Italy, setting up republics at will, and casting, meanwhile, a curious eye at the events transpiring in Paris. He returned soon afterwards, to receive honors such as no general of the Revolution had yet enjoyed, to see the government held by men of ordinary abilities and little weight of character, and to conceive plans of ambitious elevation for himself, justified by the part played by the army in the affair of Fructidor. But the time was not yet ripe; and he gladly undertook the splendid adventure of the Egyptian expedition, which the Directory proposed to him, partly in order to rid themselves of the presence of a victorious general, whose laurels drew away the public regard from their own power and persons. To furnish employment for another portion of the troops, the Directory invaded Switzerland, Rome, and Naples. This led, ere long, to the formation of a new Coalition, and the general resumption of hostilities, which continued, with various fortune, until Bonaparte, weary of the barren honors of the war of Egypt, suddenly crossed the Mediterranean and made his appearance in Paris.

During his absence, the Directory and the Councils had emulated each the other in disregard of the Constitution. First, the Directors had annulled a great portion of the elections. Then, the Councils had compelled one after

another of the Directors to resign. Every thing showed the necessity of some vigorous hand at the helm of government, of some established reputation, to assure respectability and respect to the executive functions. With Sieyes, now one of the Directors, and his brother Lucien, who presided in the Council of the Ancients, to manage political parties, — and with the admiring army at his beck to settle all difficulties in the last resort, — Bonaparte found it easy to destroy the Councils, on the 18th Brumaire, (November 8th, 1799,) and thus to impose a permanent military dictatorship on the Republic.

Into the events of Napoleon's government, whether as First Consul, as Consul for life, or as Emperor of the French, we do not propose to enter at large ; our purpose being only with the Revolution as a particular crisis of the European movement towards political and social improvement. Having reference, then, to this view of the subject, certain topics, connected with Napoleon's history, demand consideration.

Napoleon was the prominent object in the affairs of Europe for twenty years. He entered upon the scene as a soldier of the Revolution, commanding the enthusiasts of the Revolution, repelling the enemies of the Revolution. The army of Italy was composed of Republicans in theory and practice. — How did he reconcile France to the abrupt transition from the institutions and symbols of Democracy to those of a Monarchy founded by the bayonet ? — The answer is at hand. France had become altogether military in her passions and in her triumphs. The only available outlet for the prodigious activity, the fevered restlessness of the French, was war. Bonaparte made sure each step in his rise to tyranny, by daring enterprizes followed by resplendent victories, such as recalled the glories of Charlemagne. After the first establishment of the Consulate, came the battle of Marengo and the peace of Lunéville ; and the victory of Austerlitz consecrated the Empire. Thus Napoleon arrived at supremacy in France. These

extraordinary successes identified the Consul and the Emperor with the army; and, so far as the question of power went, the army was France. Military conduct is the familiar path of usurpation in all ages.

Well, then, was the government of Napoleon a *mere* military despotism? Surely, no. In the beginning, all parties courted or submitted to him, as the only resource of the Republic whereby to escape from the perpetual conflicts of faction and the horrors of anarchy. Napoleon was a great man; and great men, if not seldom ambitious of power, are generally ambitious at the same time of using power nobly and to noble ends. Thus it is emphatically with great commanders, the men, who, by eminent services in the field, gain the guidance of revolutions, the Cæsars, the Cromwells, and the Bonapartes. Every thing in France, if it testified to the exclusive temper of one resolved to rule, testified also to his restoring and renovating genius. The Committee of Public Safety had not been more indefatigable to destroy, than he was to rebuild, to legislate, to give to civilization those grand creative energies, which he denied to liberty. Through him, Christianity saw its ministers reinstated, its churches reopened, its calendar revived. Through him, the aristocracy recovered its honors and its rank, no longer capable of being the means of oppression. In him, the capitalists, the men of science and letters, the untitled proprietors, found a statesman able to appreciate the value of knowledge, enterprize, and skill, and anxious to develope, to the utmost, the resources of the nation. Prompted by the cheapness of lands, and the facility of buying them with the depreciated currency of the Republic, the rural population had almost universally become small proprietors; and they attained, under the Empire, a condition of prosperity unknown to them before the Revolution.

But if the authority of Napoleon was thus firmly based, why should it have failed to endure?—To this, also, the answer is at hand. At the epoch of the peace of Amiens,

Napoleon's destiny lay with himself to choose. Order was reestablished at home, respect, if not amity, abroad; the wounds of the Revolution were partially healed; France was great, prosperous, free; she needed only a high-minded and pure hearted Legislator, like Numa,—an illustrious Founder, like Washington,* elevated above the egotistical influences of ordinary ambition,—to confer on her well-balanced institutions of freedom, which would have rendered her a fountain of blessings to all Europe. Instead of this, Napoleon, listening to the fatal lure of empire, grasped a transitory crown when he might have worn a perennial one, and plunged France into a gambling war of conquest, doubling his stakes at each successive throw of the dice, only to end in the more utter and irremediable destruction. If he prostrated Prussia at Jena, and beat Russia at Eylau and Friedland, he did but subject himself to the necessity of continuing to conquer in the same way, or falling; and the victories, at a later period, of Eckmuhl, Essling, and Wagram, did not better his position; while his rebuff in the senseless invasion of Spain, and the desperate enforcement of the continental system and of conscription, were sapping the foundations of the Empire, in spite of its subsidiary buttresses of principalities and kingdoms. And the great catastrophe of Waterloo, following upon the bloody campaigns of Russia, Saxony, and Champagne, was the necessary consummation of the mighty conflict of nations, which, divided as modern Europe is by broad lines of national feeling, could not but end in repressing France within her ancient borders and chastising her thirst of conquest,—though it must and did fail of the main purpose for which the conflict was undertaken, that of vanquishing and suppressing the Revolution.

All things, be they clear as light, come to be questioned and debated in a speculative age. Men, who never inhaled

* Te dunque nomerò con inaudito titolo liberatore di popoli e fondatore di repubblica. Così tu alto, solo, immortale dominerai l'eternità.—Ugo Foscolo, Orazione a Bonaparte.

the smoke of powder, have disputed the courage of Napoleon, — of him, who lived, as it were, in the stricken field,— who met the shock and carnage of charging squadrons as the familiar scene of daily experience, — and who, could fear have been to him a possible emotion, yet had acquired, in a hundred victories, that sense of, and trust in, the predestined future, which belongs to the moral habitude of great conquerors. And so, also, men of purely contemplative pursuits, who consider active life, and its outstretching cares, and its deep convictions, and its comprehensive plans, through the medium of the imagination alone, deny or depreciate the genius of Napoleon. — Of such partial judges, each argues with a rhetorician's common-places, upon facts as they appear to him in the particular position he himself occupies. When the painter transfers to canvass the features of a landscape, he gives greater magnitude in the representation to objects near the point of view of the observer, not that they possess it in fact, but because such is the effect of proximity on the eye; and thus it is that men, whose lives are spent among books, and in teaching by the lips or writings, come to think that therein only is there peculiar scope for intellectual eminence. True; it well may happen that some particular poet, novelist, metaphysical or moral writer, possesses more intellect than some particular statesman, general, or legislator; but to maintain that it must in the nature of things be so, that surpassing excellence as a poet, novelist, metaphysician, or moral writer, presupposes, and will of necessity demand, more of intellect than surpassing excellence as a statesman, general, or legislator, is false philosophy, not less than narrow observation. The capacity to conceive noble and brilliant thoughts, and to fix them in the burning words of a master of human diction, is doubtless a great and valuable gift; and if it be so, then still more clearly is it a high attribute of genius to form noble and brilliant conceptions, and to fix them in glorious deeds, insomuch as deeds are worthier than words.

Napoleon abdicated the imperial throne by the act of Fontainebleau, April 11th, 1814, exchanging a sovereignty co-extensive with that of Charlemagne, for the little Italian isle of Elba; and the episode of the Hundred Days, so strange in its opening, so brilliant in its progress, so disastrous in its close, was but another chapter of romance in the adventures of the man of the age, destined to place in marked antithesis the Frankish Emperor of the Champ-de-Mai and the bound Prometheus of Saint Helena.

His downfal winds up the second great period in the Revolution. It began with being liberal in its aim, and destructive of the existing institutions of the country, with a downward tendency and movement towards anarchy. Then it became military in its aim, and *re-constructive* in its operations, with a reverting tendency again towards despotism. Thirteen years' painful trial of each of these conditions had satisfied France, that neither one nor the other suited the wants or state of the nation. With the Restoration of the Bourbons, France entered upon the third period of the Revolution. It was no longer exclusively liberal, no longer exclusively military; it had ceased to be destructive of old institutions, ceased to be *constructive* of new ones; it was now become constitutional, consecrated to the task of assuring the public liberties by means of chartered guaranties for the benefit equally of the rulers and the ruled. Napoleon told the Legislative Body that *he* was the representative of the people; and with some reason he said so; for him the people had again and again elected, to wield at will the revolutionary thunder, which, indeed, he had used, Briareus-like, to hurl down the thrones of Europe. There needs no wonder at the sympathy, which the party of the Revolution, in and out of France, has ever felt in the fortunes of Napoleon; for to his hands was the Revolution, with all its gigantic powers and purposes, for the time being, committed. When his career ended, the vast energies, which the Revolution had evoked, no longer having occupa-

tion abroad, were absorbed back into the frame of society, to be employed in the developement of its domestic resources. And the political history of the Restoration, from its beginning date down to the Revolution of the Three Days, is the history of adverse parties, contending for and against liberty on the field of the Charter.

Sieyes' Constitution of the year VIII, under which Napoleon came into power as First Consul, divided the authority of making laws between the Tribunate, which discussed and proposed, and the Legislative Body, which enacted them; and it placed at the head of the system a Conservative Senate, whose function it was to maintain the fundamental laws of the Republic. In regard to executive duties, a Council of State aided and supported the Consuls. This complex machine of government had proved eminently serviceable to Napoleon, in modifying the forms of administration from time to time, to adapt them to the successive changes in the power and title of the Chief of the State. That assembly, which had been designed for the conservation of the public liberties, proved in effect the ready and commodious instrument of their suppression in favor of the exclusive authority of the Consul and the Emperor. And now, when Europe and his own madness conspired to destroy Napoleon, the Conservative Senate was at hand, inviting to be employed as the agent for bringing about the Restoration.

As the Allies approached Paris, all those who reprobated the despotism of Napoleon, or who loved the Bourbons for themselves, began to gather courage. They were combined by their common desire of change; they were made to cooperate by the common conviction that a constitutional monarchy was best adapted to the situation of France, and that the Comte de Provence, titular Louis XVIII, was the only person in whom parties could be induced to unite. The Allies did not undertake, this time, to dictate on the subject; environed as they were with difficulties them-

selves, they were ready to acquiesce in almost any arrangement, which might rid them of Napoleon and his family. Meantime, the Duc d'Angoulême had entered France in the South under cover of the Duke of Wellington's army ; and the Comte d'Artois had arrived at Vesoul. Men began to regard the prospect of the restoration of the Bourbons with indifference, as a kind of political necessity, where they failed to desire it as a political advantage. The final consummation was brought about by M. de Talleyrand, of whom it might be said more emphatically than it was of Sir Edward Coke, that, cat-like, he always falls upon his feet. Possessing that extraordinary sagacity, which discerns the strongest party in all political changes, and the skill and ability to make himself needful to it, — Revolutionist in 1789, Republican in 1798, Imperialist in 1804, Bourbonist in 1814, and Orleanist in 1830, — Talleyrand adroitly availed himself of circumstances, at the period under consideration, to indemnify the Bourbons in the person of Louis XVIII, for all the mischief he had done to Louis XVI. His long eminence as the diplomatic adviser of Napoleon, rendered him a fit *intermédiaire* between the Allies and the malcontents of Paris.

Accordingly, the Conservative Senate met on the 1st of April, and appointed a provisional government with Talleyrand for its head ; on the 2nd it pronounced the deposition of Napoleon ; and on the 7th it published a Constitutional Act, recalling Louis, and declaring that he should be proclaimed King of the French, so soon as he should have sworn to the Constitution. By this Act, the Restoration was peaceably effected ; as all the imperial authorities, throughout the country, sent in their adhesion to the provisional government, and subsequently to Louis, the people looking on as passive spectators of a revolution, which disturbed in no respect the machinery of administration, but only changed the depository of the supreme authority. Soon the Comte d'Artois arrived at Paris, to assume the functions

of Lieutenant-General of the Kingdom, which he claimed in right of birth; and signed the convention of April 23rd, which restored the ancient limits of France. His conduct, and especially the convention, which abandoned not only the conquests of the Republic and Empire, but an immense quantity of military material, did not serve to strengthen the incipient loyalty of the French, nor was the tendency of the nation to repent of its ready adhesion to the Bourbons cured by the proceedings of Louis himself, on his arrival in France. Louis scornfully repudiated the *Acte Constitutionnel* of the Senate. By the Declaration of Saint Ouen, it is true, he announced his resolution to grant a Charter in due time as an act of royal favor; but his wilful recurrence to the old monarchy for the basis of his rights and royal style gave a mortal blow to the popularity of the Restoration.

Had the Bourbons entered cordially and unreservedly into harmony with the nation, all would have gone well with them; for the general desire of peace, the wealth and numbers of the Royalists by principle, and the aversion of all the better minded Liberals to the tyranny of Napoleon, created a vast body of interests and influence disposed to sustain Louis. But in the short space of a single year, the Bourbons contrived to disgust the army and the people, — that is, the mass of the men of the Revolution, — and thus brought on the events of the Hundred Days. When, therefore, they next returned, it was not by the will of the nation, but at the heels of a foreign army, like a harpy-train of camp sutlers. Then it was that Carnot, — next to La Fayette the most consistent of the great men of the Revolution, — who voted the death of the King in the Convention as a state-necessity, not as a party-manœuvre, — who entered the Committee of Safety, neither as a bloody partizan, nor as a frantic enthusiast, but as a conscientious Republican, submitting to the less evil of the Reign of Terror to escape the greater of the reign of foreigners, — who resisted the selfish schemes of the Directory at whatever

hazard to himself when he saw that the time for peace and consolidation was come, — who, alone of all the members of the Tribunate, opposed the offer of the Empire to Napoleon, — who, recalled from seclusion at this time by the Emperor because the country needed his transcendant knowledge of the science of war, submitted even to serve a monarch in the hour of the country's extreme peril, — this man, so true in all vicissitudes to the Republic as La Fayette to the Constitutional Monarchy, now proposed to the legislative Chambers to revive the Committee of Public Safety with Napoleon for its efficient member, and to let loose once more the enthusiasm of 1793 against the invading Allies. — But other counsels, happily it may be for France, prevailed; and the Second Restoration brought in the Bourbons in the guise of public enemies of the French.

Talleyrand and Fouché administered public affairs for the season, the Prince de Bénevente being again destined to show out a falling government, and to show in a new one; and it must be admitted that the plans of these far sighted and able men, if they could have been carried into operation, might have reconciled France to the Bourbons. But the revolutionary statesmen were odious, of course, to the emigrant Royalists; and they had forfeited the good-will of the Liberals by their activity in effecting the Second Restoration. They could not prevent the reactionary violence of the Royalists, — the massacre of Marshal Brune, of Generals Ramel and Lagarde, and of so many meaner individuals in the South, — the prosecution of Labédoyère and Ney, executed in violation of express convention, — the atrocities of the northern barbarians, who now occupied France. To conciliate the Allies, and especially Alexander, his friend the Duc de Richelleu, an emigrant French noble, but a Russian by naturalization, was placed at the head of affairs; and by him the Treaty of Paris was concluded (November 20th, 1815,) and the terms of the final humiliation of the French adjusted with the Allies.

The Chamber of 1815 was remarkable for its extravagant hostility to the Revolution, less in the interests of the King, than of the clergy and old aristocracy. MM. de Villèle and de la Bourdonnaye distinguished themselves in it, by reviving the very spirit of the last Assembly of Notables. Induced by the growing influence of M. Decazes, the King dissolved this Chamber in 1816, and convoked a new one in the terms of the Charter. For two years subsequent to that time, the Duc de Richelieu continued to sustain the liberal policy which Decazes infused into the cabinet; but, in 1818, the Duke became alarmed lest the liberal party should gather too much strength, a rupture took place between him and Decazes ; and the latter having the good-will of the King, Richelieu retired, leaving to Decazes the responsible exercise of the chief power. In the midst of heated discussions in the Chamber of Deputies and in the press, upon all party subjects, and especially upon the various projects or laws of election or censorship, Decazes held steadily on his course, enforcing a true national policy, which reconciled the interests of the Bourbons and of France.

But the unhappy assassination of the Duc de Berri by the fanatic Louvel, (February 13th, 1820,) occasioned a reaction in favor of the Royalists, and Decazes was compelled to retire from the ministry, the Duc de Richelieu returning to supply his place. From that period, every thing went wrong for the permanency of the existing institutions. Richelieu did not prove *ultra* enough for the extravagance of his party, and the exigency of the court, in which the restored Jesuits were now getting to be all-powerful. In consequence, the *deplorable* ministry of Villèle, Corbières, and Peyronnet, was appointed; and the national party fell to its lowest point of depression. To the Chambers of 1824 only twenty of the party were returned; and as the close of the life of Louis XVIII approached, all power centered in the hands of the Congregation, of Villèle with

his septennial Chamber, and of the family of Artois.

Meanwhile, events were transpiring out of France, which seriously affected her own domestic policy at the time, and are material in view of the present condition of Europe. When the Allies were at Paris in May 1814, they made arrangements for a great Congress to meet in Vienna the ensuing November, and lay the foundations of a new European system. Here assembled all that was most illustrious of the ancient dynasties of Europe, with Metternich, Nesselrode, Talleyrand, and so many others of the great names of modern times, at a kind of festival of peace, to fix permanently the immense interests, which the fall of Napoleon, and the compression of France within her ante-revolutionary limits, had left floating at large. At this 'royal mob,' it has been quaintly said, 'a kingdom was dismembered or aggrandized at a ball;' and nothing was heard, on all sides, but 'Peace! Justice! Equilibrium! Indemnity!' Then were devised those great changes in the situation of Europe, concerning which, their nature and their effect, we shall have repeated occasion to speak in the body of this work. The Hundred Days came to interrupt the *patriotic* labors of the Congress of Vienna; but the battle of Waterloo reassured its members, and confirmed them in their usurped arbitration of Europe.

The French Revolution owed much of its success to the popular sympathies of the nations of the Continent. The armies of the French Republic marched into the Netherlands, Germany, and Italy, as liberators. In the last years of its existence, the Directory had grouped around it a family of allied Republics, the Batavian, the Helvetian, the Cisalpine, the Ligurian, the Roman, the Parthenopœan. These, with other conquests in Spain and Germany, the Emperor converted into Kingdoms to be bestowed on members of his family, but possessing only a nominal independence of France. All the burden of the military levies, all the incidental oppressions of the imperial rule, weighed upon the allied Kingdoms and the Confederacy of the Rhine,

even more heavily than upon the Empire itself. If discontent obtained footing in France, it may well be conceived how much more it prevailed in the rest of subject Europe. It was in taking advantage of this fact, that the Coalition roused the physical energies of the people in resistance to Bonaparte. It appealed to their newly awakened love of liberty; it promised them representative and constitutional governments; and thus it drew thousands to its standard, who would otherwise have been hostile or inert. It maintained the same illusory language at the Congress of Vienna, in the greenness of its gratitude for the invaluable aid afforded it by Poles, Netherlanders, Italians, Piedmontese, Spaniards, — all, who had cooperated in subduing their great foe. But when danger was at an end, and the sense of it had also departed, then it was seen what faith the cause of popular liberty might repose in the pledge of princes.

Whilst the Allies were in Paris, in 1815, the King of Prussia and the Emperors of Austria and Russia met, and on the 20th of September concluded, in person, the treaty known by the name of the Holy Alliance. The treaty consisted of three articles, subscribed with their own hands, and not, as in usual course, through the medium of ministers. In the first article they bound themselves in a fraternity of mutual assistance for the protection of religion, peace, and justice; which indeterminate agreement was obscured, rather than explained, in the second article, by their professing that they regarded themselves as delegated by the Supreme Being to govern three branches of one and the same Christian nation; and the third article expressed a readiness to receive into this Holy Alliance any other powers, that would solemnly embrace its sacred principles. And on the ensuing christmas-day, Alexander, who had first proposed the engagement, issued a manifesto, in which he made public this engagement, and represented it as a reciprocal league of peace and amity, for promoting the general good of Europe.

Politicians were at a loss to conceive what could be the

concealed object of a treaty so serious and at the same time so indefinite. Ostensibly it was a mere declaration of the allied sovereigns, that, in their intercourse with each other, they would be guided by the maxims of Christianity. But why, enquired the wits of Paris, declare so anxiously that they are Christians? Have they ever been charged with a disposition to become Turks or Jews? — The inevitable inference seemed to be, that more was intended in this compact than met the eye; and when it was recollected that the same powers had formerly combined for the dismemberment of Poland, and that the empress Catherine had then employed precisely the same devout and mystical language in her proclamations, the other Allies began to feel alarmed, lest the new confederacy meditated a second scheme of unprincipled ambition. In England, especially, strong suspicions of this were awakened; and accordingly, at the meeting of Parliament the next February, Mr. Brougham moved for information on the subject; stating, as his inducement, the suspicious character of a treaty couched in such extraordinary language, and entered into at such a period without the participation of the rest of the Allies. But the Ministers ridiculed the treaty as a visionary and unmeaning project, rather than a political measure calculated to excite apprehension, and the motion was rejected.

Here the matter rested until the year 1820, when first the Spanish Peninsula, then Naples, and finally Sardinia, were revolutionized by their respective armies, which, not now the instruments of tyranny, compelled their princes to yield to each country a representative constitution. These events developed the true meaning of the hitherto mysterious compact. The question arose, whether the Spanish revolution was such an event as to require the interference of the Allies according to the meaning of the treaties of Chaumont, Vienna, and Aix la Chapelle. To consider the subject, a Congress was proposed, and appointed to meet at Troppau in Silesia, at which the sovereigns of Russia,

Prussia, and Austria appeared in person, those of Great Britain and France by their ambassadors. At this Congress the members of the Holy Alliance solicited the other two powers to make common cause with them against the revolutionary spirit, which was manifesting itself in all the Mediterranean countries of Europe. Great Britain declined doing so, thinking that such an interference in the internal affairs of other States had not been contemplated in the treaty of Vienna, and that it was not justified either by good policy or the principles of international law. The King of France did not disapprove of the proposal, but felt himself in no condition to unite actively with the sovereigns composing the Holy Alliance.

These sovereigns, therefore, being left to pursue their own course in consequence of the neutral position taken by their allies, renewed the convention of Paris, and gave the world to understand its import, by mutually engaging to prevent any political reform from taking place, either in their own dominions or in those of their neighbors. The result of the conference was, that the assembled sovereigns each addressed a letter to the King of the Two Sicilies, inviting, or more properly summoning him like a vassal, to meet them in Congress at Laybach, to settle the affairs of Naples and Sicily; soon after which a circular was published by the Alliance, in which they claimed a right, and declared a resolution, to prevent, as far as possible, any reform in the interior organization of the States of Europe. This intimation was sufficiently unequivocal; and if it had not been so, the measures taken by the allied Powers, individually, would have made an ample comment on their principles when acting in conjunction. An Austrian army was marched into Naples, and another into Piedmont, to suppress the constitutional authorities in each country, and restore the absolute authority of its King; — and a new Congress was appointed to assemble at Verona, to continue the system of dictation.

In Greece the people had commenced that long struggle against the domination of Turkey, which the other Christian States of Europe suffered to continue until the Morea became a desert. Meanwhile France also began to be disturbed by conspiracies. The whole aspect of things in Europe was novel and striking. On the one hand were seen the people, striving after improved political institutions; on the other hand a league of monarchs, banded together to put down every attempted change in whatever part of the Continent, and actually declaring perpetual war upon the liberties of Europe. If the policy of the Holy Alliance was to be maintained, there was an end of public improvement; for Europe, with all its enlarged capabilities, must remain forever stationary. There was an end, also, of national independence; for the Allies announced the purpose of intervening by force, in every country, between the people and their rulers. It was, indeed, a deliberate conspiracy among crowned heads to make despotism universal and tyranny everlasting, in all Europe. And it pointedly illustrates the abject condition of the French at this time, that, in pursuance of engagements entered into at the Congress of Verona, Louis despatched an army into Spain, to accomplish for that country, what Austria had done for Naples and Piedmont. The Spanish war, however, gave occupation for awhile to the army, and some *éclat* to the Bourbons, so that its influence was favorable, at home as well as abroad, to the ascendancy of the Royalists.

Louis XVIII died September 16th, 1824, transmitting the succession to his brother the Comte d'Artois, who took the title of Charles X. Louis possessed a taste for letters, and a disposition to reign constitutionally and legally; but, with the inert and feeble character common to the living members of the House of Bourbon, he had suffered the wrong headed and incapable Comte d'Artois to reenact, at court, the very part played by the Duke of York in the councils of Charles II. Notwithstanding his past conduct, however,

Charles gave the promise of unaccustomed liberality by an early act of his reign, as if desirous to acquire something of popularity by contrast with his predecessor; for he removed the censorship, to which the press had been subject. Still, it sufficiently appeared what party held the reins of state, from the grant of an indemnity to the emigrants, for the losses they sustained during the Revolution; the effect of which was to reject upon posterity, in the shape of a national debt, those revolutionary expenses, which had, in the first instance, been borne by the guilty aristocracy.

But other incidents happened, which spoke loudly as to the tendency of popular feeling. In November, 1825, died General Foy, an Opposition member of the Chamber of Deputies, and the most eloquent public speaker in France. Thousands of his countrymen followed his remains to Père la Chaise; and in testimony of the national respect for his character and political services, a million of francs was raised by voluntary subscription for the benefit of his family. And afterwards another significant indication of public sentiment occurred, in the fact of the rejection, in the Chambers of Peers, of a law proposed by the King, for restoring the rights of primogeniture in respect of property; which Mr Webster, with his characteristic penetration, pronounced, many years ago, to be decisive of the future political condition of France.

Indeed, the liberties of Europe, which had sunk so low in 1820, were now again manifestly on the rise. The sudden death of Alexander, in 1825, dissolved the Holy Alliance. In France, especially, the liberal party was beginning to reap the benefit of a steady constitutional opposition to the anti-national policy of the court-party. Public opinion was acquiring vigor and might; and although the electoral system of the double vote, hereafter explained, secured to the Ministers a strong majority in the Chamber of Deputies, yet the voice of Opposition was heard, and was gaining the ear of the nation. The Jesuits received a rude shock in the '*Me-*

moire à Consulter' of M. de Montlosier, who denounced them as an association prohibited by standing laws, and as inimical to the best interests of religion, society, and the throne; and obtained from the Chamber of Peers, in 1826, a vote, by a large majority, for the reference of the subject to the President of the Council.

During the year 1827 the advancement of the liberal party was yet more perceptible. The Ministers prevailed on the Chamber of Deputies to vote for a law establishing the censorship; but finding that it would not be adopted by the Peers, they withdrew it by royal ordinance. It so happened that the National Guards of Paris were reviewed by the King in the Champ-de-Mars a few days afterwards, when Paris was filled with rejoicings on account of the withdrawal of the law of censorship; and some of the Guards suffered themselves to join the people in the cry of '*A bas les Ministres!*' Hereupon the Incensed Ministers took the bold step of disbanding the National Guards as a punishment for their insubordination. This unpopular measure was followed up by the erasure of M. Hyde de Neuville's name from the roll of ambassadors *en disponibilité*, on account of his opposition to the ministry; and by a royal ordinance establishing a rigorous censorship. — The death of any prominent individuals of the liberal party, such as Boissy-d'Anglas, Lanjuinais, Larochefoucauld-Liancourt, always attracted crowds; and that of Manuel, the leading debater of the Opposition in the Chamber, gave to the people a peculiarly fit occasion to testify their hearty sympathy with the cause he represented; the multitude and excitement being even greater than at the obsequies of Foy.

At this period, as at so many others in the history of modern Europe, the political sympathy, wherewith England and France act and and react upon each other's condition, was made strikingly manifest. Forgetting all ancient enmity, their navies fought the great battle of Navarino, riding side by side as they ought in the great cause of civil

and religious freedom. Further to advance the liberation of Greece, a French army occupied the Morea, thus atoning, as it were, for its instrumentaltiy in restoring absolutism in Spain. — In Great Britain, Mr Canning openly proclaimed the approach of 'a war of conflicting opinions,' as the next which must come upon Europe. This, and the removal of Catholic disabilities, and the recognition of the new Republics in Spanish America, gave back to freedom and civilization the activity they had lost under the torpefying machinations of the Holy Alliance.

Alarmed by the signs of the times, Villèlc came to the resolution of dissolving the Chamber of Deputies three years in anticipation of the period for which the members were chosen. He proceeded on a nice calculation, in the hope and expectation of so managing the elections as to obtain a submissive Chamber for seven years to come. Simultaneously with this, it was proposed to render the Chamber of Peers more decidedly ministerial by a large creation of Peers, and by introducing the bishops into that Chamber.* But the credit of the Villèle ministry was gone ere they knew it; for a decided majority of the new Deputies being opposed to the Ministers, the retirement of Villèle and his associates became inevitable.

M. de Martignac succeeded Villèle as the responsible chief Minister. He and his associates were moderate Royalists, selected from that class of persons, who sincerely and conscientiously supported the Charter, and yet were warm-

* In England, owing to the imperfect consummation of the Reformation there, a share of the secular power of the Roman Church, as well as of its revenues, fell to the Anglican Church; and bishops *eo nomine* continued to sit in the House of Lords. In modern France, we have seen bishops in the Chamber of Peers; but it was not *eo nomine*; it was in virtue of specific temporal rank superadded to their spiritual office. Thus when the pure and venerable Cheverus entered the Chamber of Peers in the time of Charles X, he did it in right of a patent of peerage as Comte de Cheverus, not of his consecration as Archbishop of Bordeaux.

ly attached to the Bourbons. Their administration was characterized by an attempt to conciliate the public welfare with the prejudices of the court; and it failed of success, like intermediate parties in general, because it was attacked by the Liberals and the exalted Royalists with equal zeal. Martignac gave place, in August 1829, to the cabinet organized under M. de Polignac as Premier, with MM. de Bourmont, de La Bourdonnaye, de Montbel, d'Haussez, and Courvoisier as his ministerial associates. There was, in their appointment, wherewithal to disgust and confound all the elements of opposition in France. Polignac had conspired with Georges Cadoudal to assassinate the First Consul, and been pardoned. Bourmont had sued and begged for employment during the Hundred Days, and availed himself of the command he obtained in the army, to betray the Emperor just previous to the battle of Waterloo. La Bourdonnaye began a career of ultra-royalism by proposing, in 1815, a set of *categories* for the exile or other punishment of 1100 of the best names of France, on account of their participation in the Revolution. Montbel, ever since the fall of M. de Villèle, had rushed into the strangest excesses in defence of the ex-ministers, when impugned or accused in the Chamber. In short, these men, honest as some of them doubtless were, yet came into power with a load of odium and unpopularity upon their shoulders, which no patriotism of purpose could have enabled them to sustain. Unfortunately for their master, their purposes were not patriotic. As the last cabinet had received the name of a ministry of *transition*, this was not less expressively called a ministry of *menace*. In subsequent pages it will be shown how their unconstitutional measures led to the events of the Three Days, and thus reconciled France with herself, by giving to her a constitutional monarchy founded upon the recollections, and upheld by the men, of her great Revolution.

Concluding this attempt to communicate a precise idea of the French Revolution, it is necessary to recal

the doctrine or principle, wherewith we started. — There are two contrary theories, touching the Revolution, which pervade and color most of the current opinions on that subject. Look into authors of a certain class, and you learn that the Revolution was the factious work of infidels, democrats, levellers, anarchists, or what you will, of national or individual character, that is odious and reprehensible. Go to a different set of authors, and they explain it by rehearsing all the defects of political organization and abuses of government, which dishonored the France of Louis XV. Men take sides in this matter, and keenly debate which hypothesis presents a correct view of the Revolution. If the positions assumed in this and the foregoing Section be rightly reasoned, each of the two theories is partially true, and each is mainly false; neither of them can be admitted as exclusive; both are entitled to be received so far as they reach; but they fasten upon causes that are secondary, intermediate, unsatisfying; and the only principle, which meets all conditions of the question, is to be discovered by analysis of the moral and intellectual advancement of Christian Europe.

END OF INTRODUCTION.

REVIEW

OF THE

THREE DAYS.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

Page

Vicissitudes in France.—Polignac Ministry.—Public Opinion.—La Fayette in Lyons.—Breton Association.—Parisian Cafés.—Pamphlets.—Journals.—Journalism.—Comité Directeur.—Jesuits.—State of the Question.—Meeting of the Chambers.—Character of Parties. - - - - - - - - - - 1

CHAPTER II.

Meeting of the Chambers.—Speech of the King.—Address of the Deputies.—Prorogation.—Discussions.—Dissolution of the Chamber—New Ministers.—Elections.—Algerine Expedition.—State of Algiers.—Cause of the War.—Preparation.—Landing in Algiers.—Colonization of Africa. - - - - - - 56

CHAPTER III.

Consequences of the Fall of Algiers.—Ministerial Arrangements.—State of Parties.—The Ordinances.—Their Effect.—Protest of Journalists.—State of the Question.—Protest of the Deputies.—Police Arrangements. - - - - - - - - 90

CHAPTER IV.

The Three Days.—Military Arrangements.—Incidents of Tuesday—The Citizens arm on Wednesday.—Marmont's Plans.—Deputation of the Citizens.—Movements of the Troops.—Conflict at the Hotel de Ville.—Retreat of the Troops.—Their Conduct.—Barri-

cades of Thursday.—The Polytechnic School.—Position of the Garrison.—Combats.—Capture of the Louvre.—Evacuation of the Tuileries and of Paris.—Conduct of the People.—Their Losses. - - 127

CHAPTER V.

Provisional Government of Thursday.—La Fayette.—Proposals of the King.—The Duc d'Orléans made Lieutenant General.—State of Paris.—Expulsion of the Bourbons.—Remarks. - - - - 174

CHAPTER VI.

Proceedings of the Chambers.—The new Charter.—Duc d'Orléans King.—Settlement of the Government.—Impeachment of the Ex-Ministers.—Riots.—Trial of the Ex-Ministers.—Remarks. - - 214

REVOLUTION

OF THE

THREE DAYS.

CHAPTER I.

Vicissitudes in France.—Polignac Ministry.—Public Opinion.—La Fayette in Lyons.—Breton Association.—Parisian Cafés.—Pamphlets.—Journals.—Journalism.—Comité Directeur.—Jesuits.—State of the Question.—Meeting of the Chambers.—Character of Parties.

It has been the destiny of France, during the last half century, to fix the attention of the world by alternate scenes of degradation and glory;—by astonishing vicissitudes of political condition;—by the commission of the darkest public crimes, and by the exhibition of magnanimity and of enthusiasm in the pursuit of great national objects seldom surpassed;—and as the theatre, in short, of events, achievements, sacrifices, and revolutions in human affairs, whereon history delights to dwell. The epoch of the Three Days introduced another chapter of deep and absorbing interest

into her already wonderful annals. Since the Second Restoration, a period of comparatively long tranquillity, both internal and external, had elapsed, when the Revolution of the Three Days, and the subordinate events which preceded or accompanied it, came to interrupt the protracted calm and monotony of affairs, in the bosom of that people, so habituated to the contemplation of the most exciting changes, the most extreme and violent vibrations, in the combinations of its political system. Tranquil the period may well be called, for France, which, at home, saw nothing more important than the assassination of a prince of the blood, the descent of the crown in the regular order of hereditary succession, an occasional uprising and consequent *fusillade* of the uneasy spirits among the people, the suppression or re-establishment of the liberty of the press, the disbanding of the National Guards, a contested election, the funeral of a Manuel or a Foy, stormy discussions in the Chamber of Deputies, or capricious shiftings of the ministerial portfolios from one to another of the uneasy tenants of office:—and which, abroad, saw nothing more important than the unopposed invasion of Spain, or the bloodless occupation of the Morea. In our own fortunate, peaceful, and prosperous land, where a happy form of government and wise constitutional laws prevent the frequent occurrence of those profoundly interesting events, which electrify mankind, such things could not pass without filling, in our annals, a space by no means insignificant. But in France it is otherwise: for what is a change of ministry compared to a change of dynasty? The abolition of a law to the abolition of a constitution? The dispersion of a handful of turbulent students to the defeat of a noble army? The demise of a king to his dethronement? The

doating ineptitude of a Louis or a Charles, to the sublime aspirations and splendid errors of Napoleon? And the inglorious chase of the unresisting constitutionalists of Spain, how little worth it could be to men, who had participated in the magnificent triumphs of Marengo and Jena, or the bloody reverses of Leipsic and Waterloo! But animation, vicissitude, and anticipation have once more regained their sway over the course of public affairs in France, and by consequence in the rest of Europe; and, in narrating the history of the late Revolution, we enter upon the record of events, not yielding, in importance or interest, to those which signalized the days of the Republic or the Empire.

An account has been given, in the introductory pages, of the formation of that ministry, which, in the brief period of eleven months from its appointment, was destined to overthrow the throne it was designed to strengthen and confirm. M. de Polignac had been transferred from the court of St. James to the hotel of Foreign Affairs, and invested with the responsible control of the government, first as Minister merely, and afterwards as President of the Council, in order to gain a name synonymous with incapacity as a statesman and fatuity as a man. His associates were either, like M M. de Bourmont and de La Bourdonnaye, the most supremely odious individuals in France, in the estimation of the great bulk of the nation, or, like M M. Courvoisier, Chabrol, and Montbel, and M. Guernon de Ranville, who soon took the place of La Bourdonnaye, were chiefly distinguished for their known or supposed devotion to the cause of ultra-royalty and the *parti-prêtre*. Such was the cabinet, consisting of names in part but too notorious at the present hour, whose organization signalized the latter part of the year

1829; and it was received with those ominous and threatening bursts of public indignation, which clearly indicated an approaching crisis.

If the Chamber of Deputies had been at this time in session, the Opposition would, of course, have chosen that as the theatre of their resistance to the new cabinet, and the voice of France would then have been heard on this momentous subject. But Charles and his *camarilla* had purposely selected this moment for a change of ministry, in order to give the new Ministers time to mature their plans, and, if possible, acquire firmness in their places, before they should be called upon to face the Chamber of Deputies. If the opinions of the leading men of the nation had not been long before fully made up, — if the People themselves had stood in need of any regular and responsible concentration of public sentiment for their information or guidance in the emergency, the King would have derived great advantage from this arrangement. For it is to be considered that France, with its thirty millions of inhabitants, possessed but one popular assembly, but one body in which the great intelligences of the times could, in their own persons, address the language of warning or persuasion to their fellow-citizens. Provincial bodies, analogous to our State Legislatures, unfortunately it had not; for, by a political oversight of the most fatal character, the ancient provinces, which, at the Revolution, offered so favorable a basis for a Federal Republic, had been seduously and anxiously melted down in the revolutionary crucible into one homogeneous mass. Political meetings of an occasional nature, suited to the expression of opinion concerning the administration of public affairs, were either contrary to the laws, or unsanctioned by the usages, of the French. The press remained, and the press

alone, as the direct and legitimate channel for communicating to the people at large the views and feelings, the hopes and apprehensions, of the master-minds of the nation. Happily that most potent engine of public movement and impulse was, at this time, free, and was thus enabled to utter the decisions of the national will, and invoke the friends of liberty and order to stand fast each by the other in the great catastrophe that seemed impending. In what manner the press discharged this most sacred duty we shall presently see; but that it was not the press which created the public excitement, immediately consequent on the appointment of the Polignac ministry, is sufficiently proved by the reception given to La Fayette, at this period, in the South of France.

Since the Revolution of the Three Days, so many personal details and anecdotes, in illustration of that event, have been spread before the world in the newspapers, that all men now understand the elevated position occupied by General La Fayette in his own country. They have seen the extraordinary influence exercised by him, a simple Deputy, in giving direction to the march of opinions and of action. It was the accumulated result of reiterated acts of lofty patriotism at home, brightened by the reflected splendor of his illustrious reputation in another hemisphere. He had returned to France, after the American war, the youthful hero of a new-born empire. With the characteristic ardor of his nature, he threw himself into that Revolution, which, in its outset, promised so much for the lasting good of France. When bad men seized upon the helm of state, and La Fayette was compelled to fly from a country now reeling with the wild vertigo of revolutionary madness, he became the martyr of

Liberty, as the prisoner of him, who worthily rules the Croats and the Huns on the borders of European civilization; of him, who, not content with the infamy which attached to the name of Austria as the kidnapper and base jailor of Richard Cœur-de-Lion, suffered that name to be disgraced once more, by repeating the same petty outrage against the laws of hospitality and honor in the person of La Fayette. When restored to personal freedom and to his country, he proudly and conscientiously refused that homage to the victorious Child of the Revolution, which many an *émigré* professor of ultra-royalism had condescended to pay, but which La Fayette could not bestow even upon the 'great Julius' when 'false to Rome.' Consistent in his untiring zeal for rational liberty at the later epoch of the Restoration, he of course earned the honor of being hated by the Bourbons in proportion as he was beloved by France. Meantime he revisited America, and retrod, in one continued ovation, — such as never royal progress or march of oriental pomp had exhibited, — the scenes of his early usefulness and glory. Bringing back to his native country a treasure of heart-felt blessings and heaped-up tokens of eternal gratitude, to show the world how Republicans loved to honor their benefactor, he re-appeared among the children of young France, as the Patriarch of the Revolution, holding, in 1829, the liberal opinions of 1789 unshaken by misfortune or change, and standing, as it were, the immoveable god Terminus, to indicate the limits between Liberty and Despotism.

Such, at this moment, was the general position of La Fayette, — such his absolute popularity as an individual. His intimate connection with America was incidentally the occasion of a considerable enhancement of the charm attached to

his name. Colonel Le Vasseur's Journal of his patron's Visit to Ameriea had recently been published, and was eagerly read and greatly admired, as well for its own intrinsie merits, as on aeeount of the flattering pieture it gives of the politieal eondition of the United States. We in Ameriea, who judge of this work in the translation, and who are familiar with all the subjeets it diseusses, eannot fully appreeiate the exeellenee and value of it as composed for the meridian of Franee. The highly talented and most estimable author of the Journal, who courageously perilled his life in the combat of the Three Days, and bore off, in honorable wounds, the brave man's badge of glory, wrote the book for Franee, who needed the examples and information it eontained, not for Ameriea, who already possessed them in their original fullness. This publieation, therefore, so opportunely made, while it directly added to the celebrity of La Fayette, operated in the same way indireetly, by reviving the sympathies of enlightened Frenehmen in the prosperity of republican America, and gathering those sympathies around La Fayette as the visible representative of transatlantie freedom. For no American, who has associated freely with the intelligent and industrious portion of the present generation in Franee, ean have failed to observe, with gratified pride, the warm admiration they express, and evidently feel, for the republican institutions of the United States.

These explanations are neeessary to the understanding of the faet about to be related, at the same time that they will serve to elueidate the deference paid to La Fayette, as we shall hereafter see, in the preparation and aecomplishment of the Revolution of the Three Days. When the ordinanees, nominating the new Ministers,

appeared in the *Moniteur*, La Fayette was on his way to the South of France, to visit his patrimonial estates in his native province of Auvergne, which had been restored to him under the law of indemnity; and his journey was extended to the delightful residence of his grand-daughter, Madame Adolphe Périer, amid the rich vallies of Dauphiny and the Isère. Nothing, except the circumstances of his welcome to America, could exceed the enthusiasm, with which La Fayette was *fêté* by the inhabitants of the towns through which he passed. The people seized, with extreme avidity, upon this occasion for testifying their admiration of a great man and their sense of the actual complexion of the political affairs of the country. The occasion was most auspicious in both respects.

Thirty-eight years had rolled rapidly away since La Fayette was last among them; and what a mighty mass of overpowering reflections belonged to that period in the flight of time! The bright hopes of the first Constitution, the buried splendors of the Republic, the maddening excitements of the Empire, the two Restorations, with all their train of humiliating consequences, arose in quick succession before the imagination. Louis XVI, the rash tribunes of the Republic, Napoleon, and another Louis, had all passed off like a dream, and the contest for the secure possession of constitutional freedom, formerly waged by the people of 1791, was now, after so many bloody, but fruitless, sacrifices, renewedly waging by the people of 1829 with untiring resolution and pertinacity. There lived a man, bearing the name of Charles Capet and the title of King of France, to whom the dreadful lessons of the age seemed as water spilled on the ground, or seed scattered on the surface of the deep sea; and who, in sight

of the soil of the Place de la Révolution on the one hand, and the bronze column of the Place Vendôme on the other, was meditating to deprive France, as she believed, of the liberties dearly bought with her blood. La Fayette, the Champion of Freedom in 1791, re-appeared among them again the Champion of Freedom in 1829; and he seemed as one risen from the dead, the resuscitated memorial of a bygone era, a *revenu* from among the better spirits of the early days of revolutionized France, come to encourage the zealous, to fix the wavering, to stimulate the phlegmatic, and to execute a mission of gratulation and hope to a regenerated race. What fitter opportunity could be found for speaking out the universal indignation felt by the people at the appointment of a ministry, whose very existence in office they considered as a declared conspiracy against the Charter?

Accordingly, every conceivable demonstration of popular regard was lavished upon La Fayette. His reception in the great city of Lyons may be taken as an example of the enthusiasm, which animated the friends of popular rights. He was escorted into the city in triumph; illuminations and processions honored his arrival; a magnificent dinner was given him, which several distinguished patriots attended; and the toasts and speeches, pronounced at the dinner, were proclaimed in every corner of France by the thousand tongues of the newspaper-press, and in myriads of small pamphlets purposely printed to be widely circulated among the people. La Fayette and his friends, in their speeches, denounced the new Ministers as the enemies of their country, placed in office by the King as the first act in a systematized design for arbitrarily effecting a total change in the Charter and circumscribing the

rights of the people; and the speakers boldly and confidently declared that France never would and never could submit to such usurpation, but was ready to maintain, by force, the integrity of the charter. The Ministers interposed all the obstacles they could devise in the way of this continued demonstration of public exaltation, but were wholly unable to prevent its taking place. The vexation and annoyance it occasioned them was excessive, and they displayed the most petty and pitiable resentment in their attempts to check, disparage, or punish the enthusiasm of the people. They removed, for instance, the mayor of Vizille, on account of his participation in the solemnities and rejoicings in honor of La Fayette; but, unfortunately, when the appointment of a successor came up for consideration, no inhabitant of the place, qualified by law, could be found, who had not committed the same unpardonable offence, which occasioned the destitution of the late mayor. In short, the people had now acquired a vent for their feelings, a channel for pouring out their sentiments of contempt of the Bourbons, their indignation at the appointment of an anti-constitutional ministry, and their devoted attachment to the Charter and the great principles of the Revolution. And the King, if possessed of the ordinary discernment and understanding of a child, when he witnessed the loud, general, and spontaneous burst of inflamed feeling, which greeted the mere accession of Ministers of obnoxious political principles, might have anticipated the explosion to be produced by any open violation of the Charter.

Meanwhile a new measure of opposition, and of anticipated security against usurpation, perplexed and annoyed the government still more than the manifestations of regard for La Fayette, because it was a direct attack on the march of the

government itself. Apprehending, with what reason we shall see hereafter, that the Ministers intended to violate the Charter, — that a part of the scheme would be an arbitrary change of the constitution of the Chamber of Deputies, and that the taxes must of course be voted by such an unconstitutional legislature or else levied by royal ordinance without any pretence of regard for the forms of the Charter, — the people immediately saw that the taxes afforded a point of legal and peaceful resistance to the government of the most advantageous description. It was plainly impossible for the Ministers to proceed with the affairs of the Kingdom without pecuniary resources, either in imposts or loans; and the latter could never be obtained unless with a prospect of repayment by means of the former, or some mode of permanently binding the nation to their reimbursement. If the constitutional representatives of the people were deprived of their proper influence in the government, as regularly exercised in the grant of supplies, the people themselves had the power to redress the wrong by refusing to pay any tax unlawfully imposed on their estates. The idea was deemed a happy one for the liberal and national party, as it was a dangerous one for the Ministers; — and a plan was immediately arranged, and put in operation, for the accomplishment of the desired object, which, from being first adoped by the landholders of the old province of Bretagne, became known by the name of the Breton Subscription or Association.

This Association had a two-fold object. They proposed, in the first place, to refuse to pay any illegal tax, and in the second place to raise by contribution a common fund for indemnifying any subscriber, whose property or person might suffer by reason of his refusal. An article of the Prospec-

tus explains the plan in the words of the projectors. 'The subscription will form a fund common to Bretagne, destined to indemnify the subscribers for the expenses which they may incur in consequence of a refusal to pay public contributions illegally imposed: — whether without the free, regular, and constitutional agreement of the King and the two Chambers, in conformity with the Charter and existing laws; or with the agreement of Chambers formed by an electoral system, which shall not have been voted according to constitutional forms.' The scheme appears to have been a perfect one, as the means of peaceable resistance to any arbitrary acts of the government. If generally subscribed, the Prospectus would have the effect of combining the whole nation in a lawful confederacy to sustain the Charter, in spite of the physical force which might be wielded by the King. For if a subscriber refused to pay his tax, the government could but order a distraint on his property, and it was easy to foresee that this would not benefit the treasury. The whole of the *classes industrielles*, the great capitalists and landholders, the possessors of the moveable riches of the country, were in general ardent friends of the liberal cause. If they enrolled themselves as parties to the Subscription, a distraint would avail nothing, because there would be nobody to buy the property distrained; and in such a state of things, with all the wealth and feeling of the nation on one side, and nothing but a taxgatherer's warrant on the other, M. de Polignac would be greatly puzzled, even if aided by all the alchymy of the Baron Rothschild and his brothers, to transmute into good current louis d' ors that all important portion of the annual budget of one thousand millions of francs, which consists in direct taxes. If, therefore, a more summary method of testing

the strength of parties had not been adopted during the Three Days, it seems likely that the ministry must have gone to shipwreck upon the shoals of the Breton Association; for subscriptions were extensively formed, as well in the other provinces, as in Bretagne.

A Prospectus of the intended Subscription was published at Paris, on the 11th of September, in a zealous liberal newspaper entitled *Journal du Commerce*, even before the formation of the Association. The government professed to look upon the mere imputation of unconstitutional intentions, conveyed in this Prospectus, as an aggravated seditious libel, and accordingly ordered the prosecution of M. Bert, the *gerant* or responsible conductor of the *Journal du Commerce*. The ground of the prosecution was that the publication tended to provoke disobedience to the laws, and to bring the King's government into hatred and contempt, by spreading a belief that the Ministers had conspired with him to overthrow the Charter. And although the editor was condemned, yet the principles assumed by the Court, in giving judgment, converted the defeat into a triumph. The Court decided that, as the acts intended to be guarded against would be unlawful in the highest degree, it was an outrage on the government to ascribe to it the intention of committing those acts; thus indirectly sanctioning the object and principles of the Association, while condemning the publication of the Prospectus.

During the residue of the autumn, and until the announcement in January of the approaching assembly of the Chambers, no public event of much consequence transpired; but the discussion of the great political question now pending agitated all France. It is not true, as many English writers have supposed, that the large provincial cities of

France are influenced solely by the movements of the Parisians. Thus Lyons, Rouen, Bordeaux, and Marseilles, all possess their own opinions and feelings, which, in matters affecting the political condition of the country, have sometimes been in advance and sometimes in arrears of Paris. Still, as the permanent seat of the government, as the great capital of literature and fashion, as the occasional residence of the men of wealth and influence from the provinces, and especially as the seat of an administration, which is, in a remarkable degree, centralized and organized into a regular subdivision and subordination of *bureaux*, and as the focus of the national intelligence and improvement, Paris very properly, or at least very naturally, communicates an impetus and tone to public measures in the various Departments, and therefore seems to be the dictatrix of that national sentiment, of which she is merely the visible representative, the chosen mouthpiece, and, as it were, the concentration and the collected essence. There, at any rate, the changes of political feeling are best observed and measured, and the opinions expressed there will be those of men possessed of the largest means of information and the most competent powers of judgment. In addition to the Court, the high functionaries of Church and State, the wealthy manufacturers, proprietors and bankers, the multitude of unemployed officers of the army, the men of science and letters attached to the various institutions of the metropolis, and the intelligent strangers attracted from abroad, are to be reckoned the large number of clerks and subordinate *employés* of the public offices or private enterprises concentred in Paris. Therefore, in tracing the progress of opinions and events in France, at this period, it will prove to be sufficient, in general, to draw our facts and in-

ferences from the capital, as a fit barometer of the sentiments of the whole country.

Paris was, in fact, the theatre, on which the Ministers themselves chose to discuss their own purposes through that division of the press, which acted as their organs; and there, of course, the Opposition exerted their greatest strength in the same way. During the last two years, the press, having been freed from the shackles of the *censure*, had spoken with a boldness and a talent, especially in Paris, which had converted all men into politicians, and had rendered the perusal of racy political disquisitions one of the necessaries of life. The favored modes of living, in Paris, greatly facilitated the extensive circulation of the public journals, by spreading them before the thousands who frequented the *cafés*, to which same end the establishment of numerous *cabinets de lecture* largely contributed. The number of places of refreshment, at Paris, under various names, at which the journals can be read, is well known to be very great in itself, and they are scattered over every part of the city,—being, of course, especially numerous in the Palais Royal, on the Boulevards, and in other quarters where amusement or business attracts the greatest concourse of persons. But places, for the sole purpose of reading the newspapers and other light publications, had been multiplied at the period in question, through the growing interest in the subject of politics, created by the progress of free discussion. These *cabinets de lecture* are a kind of reading-room wholly unknown among us, being well suited to the exigencies of a numerous and unsettled population like that of Paris, and admirably calculated for their wants and tastes, but very different from the reading-rooms which are found in our large towns, whether provided by

editors of journals, private associations, or commercial and literary bodies of various kinds. The citizen or stranger, who enters the *Cabinet de Lecture*, pays a sous for the perusal of any paper he may select; and in the favorite promenades and public gardens, as in the Tuileries and elsewhere, little pavilions are tenanted by individuals, who keep a collection of the journals to be let on the same terms. In addition, therefore, to the ordinary means of circulating political disquisitions, which exist in other places, Paris possessed others peculiar to itself, which gave to the spirited and eloquent articles of the journalist a notoriety unequalled for extent and celerity of diffusion. The liberal party availed themselves of the facilities thus afforded, with consummate address and extraordinary zeal, spreading before the reading public, in pamphlets, newspapers and larger periodicals, an unintermittted treat of the most *appetizing* ingredients; maintaining, in short, a war of argument, ridicule, and denunciation against the Ministers, to which, indeed, the latter responded, but with far less efficiency and ability, and incomparably less of influence on the minds of the people.

Foremost, in violence of language and pungency of matter, were innumerable pamphlets of various kinds, from the argumentative octavo down to the little five sous *brochure*, which made up in extent of circulation for what it wanted in dignity of form. Vituperative histories of the lives and past conduct of the several Ministers; sharp and bitter critiques on their speeches, writings, and state papers; denunciation of their character and purposes, of the severest strain; pithy anecdotes and *bon-mots*; in short, every form of attack and annoyance, which the fertile minds and busy hands in the great literary work-shop of Paris could devise and execute, composed the staple of

this multitude of light publications. Being printed clandestinely and anonymously, in many cases, and thus free from the responsibility, either to the laws or to good manners, which checked the boldness of the periodical press, these pamphlets were often peculiarly daring and personal in assailing the royal family as well as the officers of government. Such interesting works gave ample occupation to the presses of that very prolific and highly respectable firm 'Les Marchands des Nouveautés,' whose publications might easily be found on the counters of the Palais Royal and in the Passage Colbert or Véro-Dodat, but whose printing office or study would be rather likely to elude observation.

It may well be supposed that, in these *brochures*, some Bussy-Rabatin would not fail to handle, with little reverence, the scandalous chronicle of the alleged tender interest of a certain Comte d'Artois in the Prince de Polignac; that the English connexions, known English partialities, and supposed English dependency of the new Premier, were blazoned in glowing colors; and that his want of capacity, his subserviency to the Jesuits, and his hostile intentions towards the Charter, were held up to public scorn and indignation with all the warmth of enthusiastic, but unscrupulous, eloquence. The Comte de Bourmont presented another favorite object of attack, in which, indeed, his whole military and political life were treated with unsparing severity, but which aimed its keenest shafts against his traitorous abandonment of the nation prior to the battle of Waterloo:—for few, very few of his countrymen could be found, who did not view that act of double falsehood, considering the precise moment when it was perpetrated, as treason to France rather than to Napoleon. During the few months

he was in office, the Comte de La Bourdonnaye was equally loaded with obloquy for the extravagance and absurdity of his avowed political creed, as the *preux chevalier* of ultraism, the Don Quixotte of the *extrême droit*, who had opposed M. de Villèle as almost a liberal, and M. de Martignac as little better than a jacobin. MM. Courvoisier, de Montbel, and Chabrol afforded fewer grounds of violent reproach than their colleagues; but they must have been more than human to have presented no weak point to the keen scrutiny of the wits of Paris, who knew how to depreciate and ridicule where they could not condemn. And it should be remarked, in this connection, that the new Prefect of Police, M. Mangin, was *commemorated* in these ephemeral publications, with more than his due share of bitterness, on account of his zealous and uncompromising *Bourbonism*.

The productions of the graver and of the lithrographic pencil might well have a place, along the side of the foregoing skirmishers and light troops of political warfare. Indeed, the lithrographic press is going far towards operating the same revolution in regard to the art of engraving, that the printing press has in respect of writing; having a similar, although not equal, comparative facility and cheapness in the multiplication of its productions. Of course, it is capable of no little efficiency as the vehicle for circulating impressions and sketches, and thus acting upon the popular mind. But the French are not particularly happy in the design or invention of political caricatures. In this particular they are greatly surpassed by the English, whilst the latter are immeasurably behind their national rivals in the composition of witty and well-aimed controversial writings of a light character. If the stage had not been too directly under the supervision of the

Police, the public feeling would have sought and found a ready utterance in the lesser theatres of Paris. Whenever a line occurred in Marino Falicro or the other current pieces of the day, which admitted of application to public affairs, the excitable spirits of the *parterre* were sure to single it out for their applause. But the government jealously watched to prevent any thing of a political tendency from being introduced on the stage. A trifling incident betrayed their sensitiveness on this point. The play of *Paul et Virginie* had been announced by one of the minor theatres, which little piece has among its *dramatis personæ* a man of the name of *La Bourdonnaye*. This was quite sufficient to awaken the apprehensions of the government, who anticipated, perhaps, that the occasion might be embraced by some merry 'gentlemen about town' to exhibit marks of affection for the ministerial namesake of Saint-Pierre's worthy governor; and *Paul et Virginie* was accordingly withdrawn, and another play substituted in its place.

But we are to look to the political journals, as the most vigorous and efficient combatants in the war of words, which waged at this time; and, as they exercised great influence over the public sentiment, during the whole period of the struggle between the two antagonist parties in the Kingdom, and at the crisis of the Three Days acquired a direct historical interest in the Revolution, it is proper to enter here into some explanation of the condition of the Newspaper Press in Paris. It is not necessary to examine the legal questions and provisions appertaining to this head, any further than to state that, with the exception of certain preliminary forms attending the establishment of a newspaper, one of which was the very just one of giving responsible security to meet

any claim of damages which might arise, the newspaper-press was, at this time, substantially free in the same sense that it is in the United States. In giving such security, the editor of a journal was required to choose his vocation, for the reason that a political journal assumed liabilities of a different kind from those, which attached to a *journal des modes*, a literary periodical, or a theatrical courier. And some readers may need to be informed that a much more complete subdivision and classification of the public journals exists in France than in England or America. Each *feuille* being small in its dimensions, compared with ours, is usually appropriated, in a greater or less degree, to a single class of subjects, paying only incidental attention to others out of its chief province, instead of presenting a comprehensive and universal epitome of intelligence, miscellany, and disquisitions. Thus one division of the Paris journals is devoted mainly to the proceedings of the tribunals, another to the theatres, others to religion, to literature, to the fashions, to distinct departments of science and the arts, and so forth; and these, by the conditions of their authorization, abstain from entering upon the troubled sea of political discussion, unless they give security for that express object. It is customary, also, to issue sheets devoted altogether to advertisements, called *Affiches;* so that, unlike ours, the popular daily political journals of Paris, such as the *Journal des Débats* and the *Constitutionnel*, contain but few advertisements, and a very large proportion of purely original matter. On political subjects, of course, the whole system of the mechanical arrangements appertaining to the political journals in Paris, is totally different from our own; and a popular *feuille* of that class, instead of being made up of a hete-

rogeneous mass of public documents, laws, judicial proceedings, advertisements, and stale migratory extracts from other papers, is a valuable original sheet of political news and discussions, enlivened by the admixture only of such a portion of other interesting topics as may serve to give zest to the more solid contents of the paper. They constitute a vehicle in which a man of standing and talents, an eminent statesman, a profound scholar, a peer of rank and lineage, may, without derogation from his character, communicate his opinions and views of public affairs to the people.

One of them, it is well known, is a sort of national fixture, a part of the machinery of the government, which has altered its principles a hundred times in half a century without losing its consistency; and which, although continually changing, is ever the same. The *Moniteur* is always the organ of the government, just in the same way as the letters of the alphabet are the elements of speech; and the Moniteur feels no more personal responsibility (so to speak) for the sentiments it utters, than the alphabet does for the use we make of it in the intercourse of life. This journal performs a double duty, being, in the first place, the authoritative publisher of all government-acts, such as royal ordinances, and the like; and being employed, in the second place, to defend or explain the doings of the Ministers upon information furnished by themselves for that purpose. It is an arrangement, which seems to be possessed of manifold advantages in this respect. It is highly desirable that a single journal should constantly appear at the seat of administration of a great country, for the information as well of its own citizens as of foreign nations. Great inconveniences ensue from the want of such a newspaper in those countries, where the plan is imper-

fectly carried into effect. In England, although the Courier was long the accredited organ of the Ministers, yet it was never identified with the government like the *Moniteur;* and, on a change of administration, has ceased to possess any particular authority. In the United States, the Journal has succeeded to the Intelligencer, as the official paper, and the Telegraph to the Journal, and now again the Globe to the Telegraph, as the shifting tides of popular favor ebb and flow, and one party after another gains a temporary ascendancy at Washington. It would be infinitely better to imitate the example of the French, in order that all men, at all times and places, the citizen and the foreigner, the present generation and the future historian, might be able to recur to a single journal to obtain a sure exposition of the views of the government itself and an authoritative record of its acts. It is no objection to this to say that the pages of the *Moniteur* exhibit principles of the most various and opposite character, and that so it is inconsistent with itself: so is the statute-book inconsistent; for this year it contains the repeal of the law which it promulgated the last, although its name remains unchanged. It is important now, it is desirable hereafter, to know what Ministers think, as well as what they do; and no permanent individuality of character being claimed by the *Moniteur*, no consistency is forfeited by its adopting the successive colors of the existing government.

But while the Polignac ministry found an advocate in the *Moniteur* as a matter of course, it relied upon other journals, the professed adherents of the royalist party, and by consequence of the leaders of that party when invested with the direction of public affairs. It appears from some of the curious manuscripts found in the Tuileries

since the expulsion of the Bourbons, that they very liberally employed the public money in the support of newspapers favorable to their cause, particularly at this contingency. No less than five millions of francs had been expended in the purchase of anti-national journals. *Le Pilote* had received 414,400 francs; *Les Tablettes Universelles* 384,053f.; *Le Journal de Paris* 984,933f.; *L' Oriflamme* 426,741f.; *La Quotidienne* 442,-364f.; *Le Journal des Maires* 463,500f.; *La Foudre* 49,000f.; *La Gazette de France* 391,633f. The government was fully aware, no doubt, of the truth and justice of that principle, which is laid down by Sir Francis North, who records of himself that, while other advisers of the Crown had urged prosecutions against those who libelled the Ministers, he proposed the triumphant expedient of meeting the libellers on their own ground by means of talented writers employed to defend the Ministers. Prosecutions, he wisely remarks, only serve in such cases to give popularity and importance to obscure writers of pamphlets and newspaper paragraphs. Let the Ministers employ the same weapons of satire and argument in beating down the Opposition, which the latter directs against them, and their chance of success will, in general, be far greater than by filing criminal informations. M. de Polignac made use of both expedients it is true, the latter, as well as the former; and the royalist journals, in his pay, displayed as much zeal, at least, if not as much sincerity and talent, as their more numerous adversaries. Among the newspapers, entitled to particular consideration, upon the royalist part, in the great constitutional controversy awakened by the appointment of the new ministry, the *Quotidienne* and the *Gazette de France* should be mentioned as possessing the respectability of long established

daily journals, having a name and reputation in the Departments as well as at Paris. These two newspapers participated, it will be seen, in the pecuniary support directly afforded by government to the ministerial section of the press, and are therefore open to the exception of acting a mercenary part, as the paid agents and advocates of the measures and men they upheld. Still their patrons, supporters, and conductors, were all of the royalist side from principle, or, at least, *in* principle; and they undoubtedly maintained the same cause, which they would have maintained without any golden promptings from the government.

It is perfectly notorious that vastly more of talent, standing, and intelligence was enlisted for the liberal journals, in the same proportion that the French nation, and especially the ardent young spirits of the rising generation, were in a great measure heartily attached to the liberal cause, and either zealously opposed to the Bourbons, or at any rate determined to maintain the integrity of the Charter. In fact, the *mind* of France viewed the contest as one between the nation and a single family, however the high ecclesiastics and the *émigrés* nobles might give seeming numbers and adherents to that single family. When, therefore, we come to speak of the *Constitutionnel*, the *Journal des Débats*, the *Globe* and other liberal papers, we have no longer to deal with mercenary clerks in the public *bureaux* writing up the reputation of their *chefs*, — or humble hackney-writers executing so many squares of newspaper articles according to order, to earn their daily bread, — or men habituated to laboring on through columns of vulgar ribaldry or blundering fatuity in support of whatever cause. It was the Constants, the Châteaubriands, the Bonalds, the Kératrys, the Guizots, the Broglies, and others of the great literary *illus-*

trations of France, who gave dignity and influence to the sheets of the Opposition presses in Paris. Younger and meaner men were their *collaborateurs* and the responsible editors of these journals: for who would not have been proud to act with such associates, in the furtherance of principles equally dear to the hearts of all! And although they differed in minor respects, — some being for a Republic, some for the Charter as it stood and for Charles X, but with better advisers around his throne, — and some for an amended Charter and another dynasty to wear the crown, — yet all agreed in attachment to France, and in hostility to M. de Polignac and his associates as the enemies of France.

When this administration came into office, five popular daily journals immediately and ardently pronounced themselves against it. Two of these, the *Constitutionnel* and the *Journal des Débats*, had a wider circulation, and exercised a greater influence, than any other papers in France. One of them, to be sure, spoke the sentiments of Châteaubriand, who, through all his active opposition to the Villèle ministry, and in his opposition to the Polignac ministry, retained his fidelity to the Bourbon interests, which, indeed, he has manfully maintained since the Revolution of the Three Days. How far resentment against M. de Villèle may have influenced M. de Châteaubriand, it is hard to say; nor is it material, in considering the effect of his writings upon the popularity of the government. But the other, the *Constitutionnel*, entertained no scruples to prevent its entering thoroughly into the cause of the Charter and the people, at whatever risk to the Bourbons. Next to these in order were the *Journal du Commerce*, a paper conducted with great boldness as well as talent, and the *Courrier Français*. The

Messager des Chambres was originally established in favor of the Martignac ministry, but under new control now passed into the ranks of the Opposition.

Without undertaking to specify or characterize all the daily or other papers on both sides, which at this time existed, it is enough to mention two others, that were distinguished for the efficacy of their paragraphs. One of these is called *Le Figaro*. The journals, heretofore mentioned, are dignified gazettes, of that class, which must necessarily cultivate a certain degree of *retenue* and good manners in their style of discussion and the tenor of their articles. They contain powerful discussions of great constitutional questions, elaborate disquisitions on the state and prospects of the country; earnest appeals to the good sense, patriotism, and high feeling of the nation; and attacks on the character, principles, and measures of the Ministers of a more labored and less unassuming nature. But the *Figaro* had no dignity to maintain, or *bienséances* to consult. Ridicule, sarcasm, cutting, unsparing satire, wit in every shape, such were the weapons of the *Figaro;* and it must be confessed that, however light and superficial its articles, they were signalized by talent, spirit, ingenuity, and point, which made them often of more avail than the most eloquent effusions of the *Journal des Débats* or the *Constitutionnel.* And a miscellaneous Sunday journal, denominated the *Courier des Electeurs,* acted its part very efficiently, by exhibiting often, in light spirited articles, equal hostility against the Ministers.

Leaving out of consideration the *Pariser Zeitung* and Galignani's Messenger, papers printed one in German and the other in English, and the latter with an evident leaning to the popular cause, we see that the majority of the journals in

number, and, at the same time, the most ably conducted, were opposed to the Ministers. At the same time, the increasing fermentation of the public mind, the apprehension universally entertained of an approaching crisis, and the enthusiastic ardor of the young politicians of the day, led to the establishment, in the course of a few months, of several new papers, which outstripped the older journals in boldness, and have acquired a lasting reputation by the events of the Three Days. Such are the *Temps*, the *National*, and the *Révolution*,—journals, whose names are sufficiently indicative of their character. They started into being amid the concussion of passions and opinions, 'to share in the glory and danger of the struggle;' and threw themselves into the contest with a fearlessness and a violence of spirit, which nothing but the extremity of the public exigencies could have called for and justified. And, in the course of the winter, the *Globe*, a philosophical and literary journal, distinguished by the contributions of M. Guizot and the Duc de Broglie, quitted its academic walks to engage in the agitations of the forum. In short, an extraordinary combination of ability and zeal was now exerting itself through the liberal press, having for its professed object the maintenance of the Charter, but apparently aiming at, or at least countenancing, some ulterior object; thus constituting a new power in the nation, which the royalist party designated by the name of *Journalisme*. In fact, *Journalisme* and the *Comité Directeur* formed, at this period, the bugbear of the Royalists, as the *Congrégation* did that of the Liberals. It is presumable that neither party was entirely mistaken in ascribing influence to these mysterious abstractions; and that they were not phantoms of the imagination, conjured up by excited feel-

ings in the murky atmosphere of civil discord.

Journalisme, it is plain, was no imaginary existence, but a potent and terrible engine of the times, which might well awaken the dread of an interested party, or of anti-national ministers. The periodical press was anything but a phantom. It was the Nation declaring itself against the King, and against his policy, his measures, his principles, and his advisers. Without recurring to any inferior authority, let us take, from the celebrated Report of the Ministers themselves, their views of the influence and tendency of *journalisme*. 'It would be denying what is self-evident,' they say, 'to refuse seeing in the journals the principal focus of a corruption, the progress of which is every day more sensible, and the first source of the calamities which threaten the Kingdom. Experience speaks more loudly than theories. Men who are doubtless enlightened, and whose good faith is not suspected, led away by the ill-understood example of a neighboring people, may have believed that the advantages of the periodical press would balance its inconveniences, and that its excesses would be neutralized by contrary excesses. It is not so: the proof is decisive, and the question is now judged in the public mind. At all times, in fact, the periodical press has been, and it is in nature to be, only an instrument of disorder and sedition. * * * It endeavors, by constant, persevering, daily-repeated efforts, to relax all the bonds of obedience and subordination; to weaken all the springs of public authority; to degrade and debase it in the opinion of the people; to create against it, every where, embarrassment and resistance. Its art consists, not in substituting for a too easy submission of mind, a prudent liberty of examination, but in reducing to a problem the most positive

truths: not in exciting upon political questions frank and useful controversy, but in placing them in a false light, and solving them by sophisms. The press has thus excited confusion in the most upright minds, has shaken the most firm convictions, and produced in the midst of society a confusion of principles, which lends itself to the most fatal attempts. It is by anarchy in doctrines, that it paves the way for anarchy in the State.' Such is the view taken of the character of *journalisme* by the Ministers; and it is evidently a false one; for it is nothing but the case made out in all ages by the few, who have violently possessed themselves of undue power, in opposition to the many, who are continually seeking, by peaceable means if they can, by forcible if they must, to restore the equality of political rights, which the God of Nature and of Christianity bestowed on the human race.

In fact, it is not so much the periodical press, as it is the art of printing, or rather the faculty of thinking and writing, whose usefulness the French Ministers would thus impugn. Tyranny and misrule have always had their grudge against the press; and MM. de Polignac, Montbel, and their associates, were not singular in their unfavorable estimate of its tendency, as an agent to spread abroad the impression, operations, and results of mind. We should be departing from our present purpose to argue the minor questions growing out of this subject; and to argue the general question in the United States would be as idle a task, as to inquire whether Washington was a great man, Franklin a wise man, or Arnold a bad man. America settled all those points, to her own satisfaction at least, if not to the satisfaction of the monarchs and their ministers in Europe, soon after the year 1776. Let us confine ourselves,

therefore, to the remarks necessary to disposing of this matter as *an important fact* in the late affairs of France.

M. de Polignac's position is that 'at all times the periodical press has been, and *it is in its nature to be, only* an instrument of disorder and sedition;' and this is most manifestly false. Was the periodical press 'only an instrument of sedition' under the paternal guidance of the *censure* in the reign of Louis XVIII? Was it only an 'instrument of sedition' in the reign of Napoleon, when it very judiciously and complaisantly uttered what he directed, and loyally supported the most legitimate of emperors, him, who carved out his own empire with his own good sword, instead of deriving it from the accident of parentage, or by transmission through the vulgar channel of birth? Is the *Gaceta de Madrid* or the Austrian Observer 'only an instrument of sedition'? It is clear that all the sedition which these pliant 'instruments' of power excite, arises out of the disgust and recoil which their subserviency awakens in the breasts of the friends of justice and liberty. Nay, to come directly to the very case itself, was *La Quotidienne* 'only an instrument of sedition'? Was *Le Drapeau Blanc*? Was *L'Oriflamme*? If either of these journals furthered the cause of 'anarchy,' or served as a 'focus of corruption,' it certainly was no want of good will to the descendants of Saint Louis, or of zeal in support of the 'divine right' of kings, which subjected them to such ungrateful reproof at the hands of Charles Dix.

M. de Polignac's primary error, therefore, consists in attributing to the whole periodical press a character only to be pretended, upon his own premises, of that portion of it, which professedly acted in defence of the Charter

If the newspapers, on that side of the question, were, comparatively speaking, so numerous, so able, and so influential, as to constitute a new power in the State, it was either the fault of the Ministers or the fault of their cause. If their cause was that of truth and reason, why did they not make it appear? If their cause was that of the national good, why did they not carry with them the feelings of the nation? They understood well the Lord Keeper North's panacea for counteracting the poisonous effects of political libels against the government, and they administered the medicine, it seems, in very liberal doses. Having the means of diverting unaccounted millions from the pockets of the people into those of such skilful controversialists of their party as stood ready to fight the ministerial battles, if they accomplished nothing it must have been because their cause was a bad one, since the vantage ground was theirs, and they were contending, not for honor merely, or abstract principles, but for their very existence. As to the influence of *journalisme*, therefore, in producing the Revolution of the Three Days, the plain unvarnished fact is this: — The liberal journals supported the interests of the nation, while the ministerial journals were doomed to the laborious and ungrateful task of supporting the adverse interests ' de deux vieillards et d'un enfant,' with their dependants, who had been forced upon France by the bayonets of her confederate enemies. The Bourbons, ' the two old gentlemen and one child,' constituted one party, and France constituted the other. Of course, notwithstanding all the immediate power possessed by the King, as the fountain of honors, the dispenser of rank and office, the head of the army of troops and army of *employés*, and master of the public revenues, — notwithstanding

all this, when the question came to be, who should reason best, who should write best, who should conduct a newspaper best, the King or the Nation, it was easy to foresee that all the ripe, spontaneous, independent, patriotic talent of France would speedily be concentrated into the new power of *Journalisme*.

The remaining subject of horror, which so disturbed the tranquillity of the government, was invisible in itself, however sensible it may have been in its effects: namely, the alleged *Comité Directeur*, a supposed permanent body, stated to have its head quarters at Paris, and to have for its object, to give organization, system, and consequent efficacy, to the efforts and measures of the constitutional party. What the fact may be, in regard to any such secret 'Committee of Safety,' does not distinctly appear; but certainly it would be strange if such a body had not existed, considering the stormy aspect of public affairs. Here was a matured plan, it was believed, on the part of the King, to endeavor, by means of his Ministers, to overthrow the Charter. The Ministers were the King's permanent *Comité Directeur* to revolutionize France in the interests of despotism. What more natural and reasonable than that the people should have their *Comité Directeur* to sustain the constitution of government as it was, or even to revolutionize France in the interests of liberty? All the advantages were certainly on the side of the King's *Comité Directeur*. They had the physical force of a large standing army and all the apparatus of war at command: their antagonists had nothing to meet it but moral courage and brave hearts to abide the issue. The people, unfortunately, had to furnish funds for both sides. For we may be sure, that neither Charles nor M. de Polignac provid-

ed, out of their own private resources, the budget of ten hundred millions of francs, which they had both power and will to employ in furtherance of their schemes of usurpation; and we may be equally sure, if MM. La Fayette, Lafitte, and their friends expended any money in the establishment and support of journals, in defraying the cost of defending against political prosecutions, or otherwise, that neither was this money derived from the private patrimony of M. de Polignac or Charles. We cannot suppose that such a desperate moral contest, as was carried on by the national party in France, from August of 1829 to July of 1830, was conducted without some degree of concert among their trusted leaders, or a certain quantity of *revolutionary rent* to meet the unavoidable expenditures of such a crisis. And it is known, from authentic documents now before the world, that the Ministers were combined in an illegal purpose, and profusely employed the public money in promoting it. Nay, if the Liberals had a secret *Comité Directeur* to manage their affairs, was there not a secret *camarilla* behind the throne, an irresponsible cabinet, equally unknown to the Charter with the *Comité*, and at least equally dangerous to the State?

And this inquiry brings us to the other mysterious power, whose operations were too sensibly felt, and which constituted the subject of horror to the friends of the Charter, namely, the Jesuits, and the *Congrégation* or affiliated disciples of the Jesuits, having ample scope for intrigue as members of the Court or personal associates of the Sovereign. It was well remarked, on the appointment of the Polignac ministry, that it could not stand; for the Ministers are alone, it was said; nothing sustains them but the clergy and the Ultras; and in France there are but forty

thousand priests and a hundred thousand Ultras, to withstand thirty-one millions eight hundred and sixty thousand Constitutionalists. But, in admitting the truth of this remark, we must consider the greater means of *direct influence* possessed by a *camarilla* of clergy and courtiers behind the throne, than can be exerted by the well wishing, patriotic individuals of the people at large.

We might well believe, if we did not know, that the Court of a returned emigrant like Charles X, a man in his dotage, with but scant remains of the little sense he ever was blessed with, and given up to ascetic observances and the chase, without either capacity or inclination to elevate his understanding to the level of the times, — that in such a court men of his own temper, character, and fortunes, would be the favored private advisers of his conduct and keepers of his conscience, whoever might be his responsible public Ministers. The lay members of the Court, of course, would consist of the privileged families of the *ancien régime*, accustomed to bask in the sunshine of royal grace, and to feed their extravagance out of the treasures of the state; sinecurists and household functionaries and favorites, the retained representatives of those courtiers by profession, who had ruined the Bourbons once, and were now laboring in their vocation to do it again. 'Habituated,' says a lively French writer, 'to contract debts, to spend beyond their revenues, to live tranquil in presence of a large mass of creditors, who could be silenced by a *lettre de cachet* if occasion required, they did not now relish absolute submission to legal order. No longer to find an odious protection in the misapplication of the laws; to be compelled to live on their income, and not at the charge of the traders or the royal treasury; to be able now to devour only a deter-

minate quantity of the civil list, and no more, for the *Cour des Comptes* stares them in the face; to be debarred from making large fortunes by means of favoritism or the mistresses of the King; to tolerate a free press, which unceasingly reproaches the exactions and follies of those in power; no longer to tyrannize over comedians and authors: — Such are the undying tortures which perpetually sting the gentry of the Court. These bloodsuckers of the throne and the nation wish for the whole, while they can have no more than their appropriate share; and hence they are sworn enemies of the Charter, because it is the Charter which binds them down to that state of things, in which consists, not their happiness, but the happiness of France.'

If this picture is highly colored, it undoubtedly possesses too much truth. France was young and new, while the Court was old and decrepit. France had been recently accustomed to nobles by nature, not by parentage; to courtiers who could speak of their own achievements, not of their ancestors in the middle ages. The Court of the Restoration had abundance of old historical names to show, but France had forgotten them; the *illustrations* of the Republic and the Empire were resplendent with cotemporary triumphs, which had effaced the expiring glories of men, who held their honors by virtue of the deeds of some old knight of yore, who died in his harness four hundred years ago, in a petty skirmish under the banners of Orleans or Burgundy. Who now thought of Duras or Aumont, or cared for Rohan or Polignac? But the name of Lannes or Ney, of Soult or Masséna, was like the voice of a trumpet swelling upon the ear from the distant hills. It spoke to every soul in France of stricken fields, of victories achieved, of glories ineffacea-

ble, of imperial splendors; of all that could madden the fancy and dwell in dazzling brilliancy before the mind's eye forever. Is it wonderful, then, if the Court, which surrounded Charles and Louis Antoine, was little respected by the people, and gained no confidence from them; or if this Court, with the sympathies it possessed and the position in the public estimation it occupied, should have given occasion to make itself considered, in its general influence, hostile to the Charter?

The people entertained, at this period, still greater distrust of the influence of the Jeuists. They saw the *Congrégation* extending its ramifications through all the provinces, receiving many accessions from superstition, but more from policy and aspiring motives, and especially potent in the region of the Palace itself. They had struggled hard to procure even the nominal enforcement of the laws against the Jesuits, and with little effect. France believed that, if this intriguing and ambitious order of priests had sway, although they conspired with the King and the aristocracy to enslave the people to-day, they would, when they had advanced thus far, conspire with the lowest of the people to enslave the King to-morrow; and that they labored the triumph of absolutism only in order afterwards to build up an Inquisition by its means. In a country like France, where genuine and rational religion had unfortunately lost so much of its authority, it was not to be presumed that any forbearance would be felt for designing hypocrisy which assumed its garb, or ambitious jesuitry, seeking temporal power through the permission of its forms.

It has been deemed proper and useful, as well as consistent with the nature of this work, to enter into such considerations, although in part some-

what argumentative in their nature, because they present a view of the facts, which, as we go along, will be found gradually to unfold the causes of the Revolution of the Three Days. Let us proceed, therefore, to examine the state of the great question at issue between the two parties, as presented to us in the journals and elsewhere, during the period anterior to the convocation of the Chambers.

From the very instant of the announcement in the *Moniteur*, of the appointment of M. de Polignac and his associates, a never ceasing war of obloquy had been carried on by the writers in the interest of the Opposition. The liberal party did not pretend that any unconstitutional measures had been adopted by the Ministers, but took a stand against their supposed intentions, as inferred from various circumstances. Of this course the Ministers complained, as being factious and unjust. Wait, said they, until we violate the Charter, or manifest some disposition to do it, before you treat us as miscreants and traitors. The King has exercised his constitutional prerogative in selecting us to be his responsible advisers; it will be time enough to denounce our character and conduct as Ministers, when as Ministers we deserve reproach by the commission of illegal acts. To this the liberal party replied: — We know that your purposes are bad, and we can hope to prevent their accomplishment only by anticipating your design, and preparing the nation to meet the possible contingency; and until you leave the ministry, and men of other principles are appointed in your place, we shall not cease to sound the tocsin of alarm and proclaim our distrust of the government. Which side was justified by the facts?

When we consider what the Ministers actually

did in July of 1830, and recollect how truly the liberal party anticipated their design eleven months before, it would seem that some obscure intimation of that purpose had escaped from those, who were at the bottom of the plot against the Charter. It may be, however, that, from discussions among the courtiers of what was feasible or expedient, men acquainted with the feelings of the King could form a pretty safe conjecture as to what the Ministers would attempt. A blow at the liberty of the press, it was, at any rate, reasonable to expect, although not in what precise manner and time it would be struck. Intentions to alter the composition of the Chamber of Deputies by ordinance, and to remodel the electoral system in the same way, were confidently imputed, as steps to be taken preparatory to gradually doing away with all those provisions of the Charter, which abridged the power of the crown. Such were the designs attributed to the Ministers, and of which the people were called upon to beware.

But on what ground, it will be asked, did the Liberals pretend to believe that the Charter was in danger? The answer is, that the known character, the avowed politics of the Ministers, and the fact of their being in office, were sufficient to convict the King and the Dauphin of meditating a violation of the Charter. M. de Martignac and his colleagues were royalists; they were no revolutionary zealots, neither democrats nor Bonapartists. Why were they thrust out of office, unless because they were considered too moderate, too temporizing, too conscientiously attached to the Charter? No other plausible reason could be or was alleged. Again, when the Martignac ministry was displaced, why were Polignac, and Bourmont, and La Bourdonnaye placed at the head of affairs, unless because they were *ultra* in their

principles, and prepared, from rashness or ignorance, to go further in the cause of absolutism than M. de Martignac could be induced to proceed? No other plausible reason could be or was alleged. These Ministers are not to be considered as new men, of untried opinions, whose future acts could be left to develope their principles, that so they might be judged. It would have been as easy to suspect the Duchess d'Angoulême of republican tendencies, as M. de Polignac or M. de la Bourdonnaye of affection for the Charter. Long since they had not only hoisted their colors, but nailed them to the mast. M. de Polignac was the reputed son of Charles X, in the same way that Richard became the father of Faulconbridge; and he arrived at the premiership, not as M. de Villèle did, by force of talents, by parliamentary address and influence, by capacity for conducting public affairs, but as De Luynes or Cinq-Mars obtained the helm under Louis XIII, or Robert Carre under James I, through the by-paths of personal favoritism. It was undeniable that whatever the King's *camarilla* willed, Polignac would will, because it was only to represent them, and to act for Charles as an individual, not as the sovereign of a great nation, that he was made Premier. M. de La Bourdonnaye was the furious orator of *ultra ultraism;* the extreme of the *extrême droit.* M. de Bourmont was, in his political fortunes, indissolubly identified with the Bourbons as a family, ever since that act of treachery, which gained him the indignation of all France. It was enough for the Liberals, then, to see such men in the control of the government. This fact alone was decisive of the question; for how did they come into office, but under pledges to sustain the counter revolution and absolutism?

Unfortunately for M. de Polignac, he was open to the imputation of being subservient to the views of England; an alleged subserviency, which, real or imaginary, was a very efficacious ground of reproach, in consequence of the excessive sensitiveness of the French people on this subject. His wife was English, his fortune was in England, his children were brought up in England, he professedly admired the English constitution as the exemplar of a perfect government, and he was a personal friend of the Duke of Wellington, having long resided in England in the capacity of ambassador of King Charles. These circumstances were sufficient to countenance the imputation, and to enable the Liberals to employ it as the means of augmenting his unpopularity; but it proved, in the sequel, that he paid but too little heed to the warnings of Wellington against attempting a *coup d'état.*

It is one of the extraordinary features of the period, that the *Quotidienne*, and the few other papers which supported the Ministers, performed their duty with a feeble and timid spirit, which was oddly contrasted with the affected scorn of the liberal party, and the blustering tone of assumed defiance and reproach, which marked their effusions. They were very liberal and profuse of the terms jacobin, *révolutionnaires*, enemies of the King, and the like; but they made a wofully lame apology for the characters and known principles of the Ministers; and, by the course of argument they pursued, as to the question whether a violation of the Charter was contemplated, they by no means tended to allay the public ferment and agitation. Among the documents, which have come to light since the Three Days, are some which explain this seeming mystery. It is demonstrated that the King and his back-stair cabinet were

determined to expunge the Revolution, so to speak,—to carry France back to the good old days, when instead of an elective Chamber was a convenient Council of State; when the Ministers were responsible to no one but the King, and the King was responsible to nobody but his public harlot, some shameless Madame de Pompadour or Madame du Barry; and when, so long as the hereditary head of the State had a *Parc-aux-Cerfs* to repair to for his amusement, and so long as the *noblesse* about the Court had free access to the Treasury, it mattered little what became of the tax-paying *paysans* and *bourgeois* of France.

It seems that when La Bourdonnaye gave place, in November, to M. Guernon de Ranville, this gentleman, in entering the cabinet, felt bound to file a sort of protest against their proceeding in their intention to *nullify* the Charter. 'The project,' he says, 'which some imprudent royalists would wish to push the Government to adopt, would consist in dissolving the Chambers and convoking a new one, after having modified by ordinance the electoral law, and suspended the press by re-establishing the censorship. I know not if this would save the Monarchy; but it would be a *coup d'état* of extreme violence. It would be a violation of the thirty-fifth article of the Charter; that is, a violation of the oath taken to maintain it. Such a step would never become the King nor conscientious Ministers.' Unhappily for the Bourbons, the ingenuous advice of this their devoted servant, a man of unsuspected attachment to their dynasty, was not favorably entertained; and the Minister himself was afterwards reasoned out of his own better judgment, and driven into a participation in the act of 'extreme violence' which ruined the Monarchy and himself.

Other advisers were at work whose counsels were more palatable to the weak prince on the throne, than those of the clear sighted M. Guernon de Ranville; as plainly appears from the language of a memorial communicated to the Dauphin by some irresponsible foe to the liberties of his country. 'A sovereign,' says the memorial, 'may make *coups d'état* for the good of his subjects. They will almost always succeed, if he shews that they are for the benefit of great proprietors and the army, *provided force and secrecy are employed in their execution*, and prompt justice is executed on the factious. *Bayonets support thrones*. The soldier belongs to him who pays him. The party of the liberals is without a chief. That the people or the troops should revolt, they must find or hope for safety and guarantees. It is not a few groups of students, easy to be dispersed by a few shots or a few charges of cavalry, that will give those guarantees.' Here are precious maxims for a constitutional King. The *great proprietors*, that is, the oligarchy about the throne, are to be flattered and conciliated with the promise of power, and the army is to be corrupted by largesses, and then all will go well: for thrones are supported by 'bayonets,' not by the affection of the people. This rule of governing, to be sure, may not prove acceptable to the millions who pay and suffer; but no matter; they are unarmed; they are base fellahs, born to till the ground, to discharge imposts, to beget slaves, and to die; and if they speak of their chartered rights, the bayonet, the sabre, and the guillotine will reduce them to silence and submission. Thank God that 'the people' and 'the troops' and 'a few groups of students,' of whom this memorialist speaks so contemptuously, gave a lesson to crowned heads on 'the 29th of July,' which will be remembered by the servile instru-

ments of oppression in Europe, so long as a king exists on earth.

But the memorialist proceeds in an equally significant strain. 'Strike,' says he, 'strike with a firm hand the institutions which owe their birth to the Revolution, and by which it is perpetuated.' That is, suppress the Charter by force, and abolish all the just and equal laws of the last forty years: and he might as well have added, demolish half Paris and waste France with fire and sword; for it is the splendid monuments of one and the wide spreading prosperity of the other, *qui perpétuent la révolution.* 'The national representation is contrary to the genius, the manners and the character of a nation frivolous and turbulent like ours. With fifty thousand advocates, and the same number of attorneys and clerks, and such a host of physicians and surgeons imbued with revolutionary principles, the representative form of government, resulting from the Charter, is a continual struggle of parties, which engenders disorder, divides the country, and enfeebles the State. There is a repugnance, a natural antipathy between France and the representative system. The Monarchy requires, in order to be firm and preponderating without, as well as within, a *Supreme Council, not two rival Chambers.* The *noblesse* has incontestable rights to the administration of the State; and the clergy can no longer remain a stranger to the government of France.' Can the mind conceive of principles more wretched, counsels more infatuated, or ignorance more profound, than these passages exhibit? It were idle to extenuate and impossible to justify the excesses of the French Revolution; and yet, so long as kings maintain that no faith is to be kept with their subjects, and no oaths are binding in the favor, and that their fellow men are of no

farther consideration but to be 'taillés et corvés à la miséricorde,' for the benefit of a few idle and profligate courtiers, — what lover of liberty can discipline his republican feelings into a state of very extreme sorrow, that a terrible lesson of retributive and reciprocal justice should occasionally be visited on such systematic enemies of the whole human race?

It being thus seen what was the nature of the apprehensions entertained by the constitutional party, and how much cause there was for such apprehensions, but one more subject needs to be touched, before proceeding to the meeting of the Chambers; — and that is, the probable issue of a decisive struggle. All that the Liberals asked, and all that they professed to desire, was the conservation of the Charter and the appointment of a national ministry. Yet it is undeniable that, so early as the close of 1829, very just calculations could be made regarding the probable event, if the King should tamper with the Charter and fail. Many hoped and desired that he would attempt a *coup d'état*, in the anticipation of its resulting in the gratification of their peculiar feelings and wishes. But even those, who believed in the expediency and success of a *coup d'état* as a royalist measure, could not fail to reflect on its *possible* failure, and to look to what would be the consequence. The analogy, thus far strikingly perfect, between the history of the three last Stuarts in England, and the three last Bourbons in France, was continually followed out in private conversation to its final catastrophe, and not seldom alluded to in the newspapers, especially those of Great Britain. And the mere contemplation of this analogy had great influence in familiarizing the minds of men to the idea of the Duc d'Orléans as a kind of predestinated substitute for Charles X. With-

out anticipating the history of a later period, by undertaking to develope the various circumstances of family and personal popularity and public convenience, which subsequently raised Louis Philippe to the throne, — it suffices to speak of the under current of public sentiment, the privately expressed opinion, the half formed fears or hopes, which might be discerned in France late in 1829, and before actual collision had taken place between the people and the King personally.

The fact certainly was that, at the period in question, the Orleans family occupied this singular position, in the supposition of an impending revolution: They were the first choice of but few, they were the second choice of nearly all. The Republicans regarded the succession of the Duc d'Orléans as the next best thing to the establishment of a Republic; the Bonapartists admitted that it would be next best to the restoration of the rights of the young Napoleon; and the Bourbonists felt it would be next best to the continuance in power of Charles or Louis Antoine, or young Henri. The Republicans would prefer it, immediately, to the reigning family or to the son of Marie Louise; the Royalists to Napoleon or a Republic; and the Bonapartists to a Republic, probably, certainly to the Bourbons, whose thorough adherents formed a very small fraction of the nation, and that fraction neither the most intelligent nor the most influential. And thus Louis Philippe, while, if he relied for success on choice by absolute preference, had little chance of reaching the throne, had the fairest prospects as the choice by compromise and political necessity.

Such was the state of public affairs, when the royal ordinance appeared on the 7th of January, appointing the 2d of March ensuing for the assembling of the Chambers. It could no longer be

said that the King intended to dissolve the Chambers, and thus save the Ministers from the inconvenience of meeting the representatives of the nation. The question now was, what the Chambers would do, and what the Ministers, in case the Legislature should go so far as to insist on a change of ministry as the condition of a vote of supplies. Meanwhile, after six months of inactive irresolution, of almost absolute quiescence, of timid, fearful movement in the mere vicious circles of *bureaucratic* formality, the Ministers had really ventured to do something, to take a step in office of some kind. As to the internal affairs of the Kingdom they had gone so far as to conclude to face the Chambers; and they even made a couple of *moves* in relation to external affairs.

The wise rulers of Europe, who had crushed the power of the Sublime Porte by mere inadvertence, and called into being a Republic on the shores of the Mediterranean by mistake, were sorely puzzled to decide how to retrace their steps with becoming solemnity and gravity, so as not to encounter too much reproval from an injured fellow-king, nor too much ridicule from scoffing and irreverent liberals. Among other ingenious manœuvres to this effect, they were now busy in selecting some unprovided member of the royal *clique*, to be imposed upon Greece, with as little consideration for the wishes of the interested parties, as they had formerly shown in subjecting Genoa to the King of Sardinia, Belgium to William of Nassau, or France to the Bourbons. The fact at length became known, that the choice of the Allies had fallen upon Prince Leopold of Saxe Coburg, and was made the subject matter of most vehement declamation against M. de Polignac, in consequence of the relation Leopold stood in as to Great Britain. All that had been said at first

against Polignac, as being under English influence, as being the tool of Wellington, and so forth, was now renewed with tenfold fury. What! said they: did the French fight the battle of Navarino, did they expend their blood and treasure in driving Ibrahim from the Morea, that the son-in-law of George IV, uncle and nearest male relation of the Princess Victoria, the dependent pensioner of England, should be King of Greece? It seemed to their excited minds incontrovertible proof of the subservience of the Prince de Polignac to the ambitious views of Great Britain, and continued to be the subject of angry discussion, until other more deeply interesting topics came to supply its place.

The Ministers had also undertaken, in sober earnest, an expedition against the Dey of Algiers, with whom France had long been at issue, without taking any decided measures to bring the controversy to a close. Had they gone about the expedition in good faith and with singleness of heart, solely for the vindication of the honor of France, it might have been serviceable to the reputation of themselves and their master. But they had been so baited by the liberal party, that they could undertake nothing, think of nothing, except as it bore upon the question of their ministerial popularity, and the success of their conspiracy against the Charter. Therefore, instead of going to war with Algiers in order to punish a violent horde of pirates, as England had done not long before; — instead of going to war in Africa to make a rich and valuable conquest, as England was doing every few years in Asia; — instead of pursuing either of these objects, M. de Polignac entered upon war as an electioneering manœuvre, hoping to divert public attention from his domestic plans by giving it new occupation

abroad, and to strengthen himself in the public favor by providing food to gratify the passion for military glory, which so generally prevails in France. But, detecting and exposing his purpose with their customary readiness and address, the liberal party converted even this far-fetched scheme of popularity into additional ground of condemnation and disgrace.

Events now began to assume that rapid march, which had been so long preparing by the discussions and agitations, explained and described in the foregoing pages. The Legislature met at the appointed time; and the remarkable part it performed may warrant some details as to the parties which composed it, and the prominent men in each party. While every one knew, familiarly, the general division of each Chamber, attentive observers could go further, and single out fractions of the several great parties, sometimes almost as hostile to each other, as the primary parties themselves. Beginning with the Chamber of Deputies as the popular and elective branch, let us afterwards add a few words concerning the Chamber of Peers.

Conspicuous in the Chamber as the professed friends of the crown, was the *Contre-Opposition*, the administration party, that is, commonly known from their local position as the Right. In this section you might see some, who, independent royalists, having come to the Chambers with sentiments rather unfavorable to the constitutional system, had learned to admit the necessity of it for the safety of the throne, as well as for the tranquillity of France. These men formed a valuable ingredient of the Chamber. They were Constitutionalists in good faith, always inclining, nevertheless, to strengthen the royal prerogative. They spoke a constitutional language, respected

the Charter, and had resigned themselves to follow its forms, without seeking to infringe or nullify it. In the same general division were men, who, feeling as if the great question still was between Royalty and the Revolution, were disposed to sustain the government in its political weakness, but guided by conscientious motives, also stood ready to repulse jesuitical influence, and to demand economy in the public expenditures and a proper consideration of the public welfare. There, also, it is certain, were some men whose whole souls were given up to the *contre-révolution* in its purity and simplicity, who had reproached all past administrations for not rushing fast enough in a retrograde career, who hailed with joy the advent of Ministers after their own heart, and whose only fear was lest a lingering scruple of timidity or indecision, should so check the liberticide dispositions of M. de Polignac, as to save the Charter yet a little while. And associated with these last were some few fanatical *congréganistes*, urging the government to give free scope and career to the movements of the Jesuits. Such were the *Contre-Opposition.*

From the very commencement, a large third of the Chamber had consisted of the old and constant friends of liberty, headed by the men who had ever been true to France. We may be sure their numbers had not diminished under the *conceding* ministry of Martignac, nor their zeal under the *non-conceding* ministry of Polignac. These Deputies, strong by their talents still more than by their numbers, might be regarded as the type of a true national representation. You saw there the choice spirits of France; *illustrations* of every class; the delegation of the genuine interests of the nation; *les gloires* of the army, of science, of literature, of philosophy, of the bar; the eminent

names among the great landholders, the capitalists, and the manufacturers; the old *célébrités* of the year 89 and the new ones since aggregated to their noble phalanx. Whatever shades of division might exist among these soldiers of the Charter, however they might individually desire to infuse more or less of liberty into the institutions of their country, they were firmly united in one thing, and that was, determined hostility to the Polignac ministry, their measures, principles, and intentions.

Neutrality and moderation in politics, however patriotic the motive of the individual professing these qualities may be, are never held in high favor in a great national crisis. Neutrality is apt to be considered the retreat of time-serving men, who have not independence enough to throw themselves frankly into the ranks of any decided party. Unquestionably, however, the right and left *Centres* of the Chamber contained many worthy men, who could not be accused either of timidity or of calculation in assuming a kind of intermediate position between the widely sundered extremes of the Opposition and *Contre-Opposition*. Besides, it was but a few years since, that, of more than four hundred Deputies, only *thirty* were found to vote against the Ministers; and now they outnumbered their antagonists, perhaps, or at least were likely to do it with the aid of the Centre.

In characterizing the smaller subdivisions of this Chamber, a spirited author has said that the extreme Right consisted of the jacobins of Royalty; the Right, of Royalists somewhat less furious than their neighbors; the Right Centre, of Royalists having a violent inclination to be reasonable; the Left Centre, of Royalists who desired a varnish of constitutionality over the solid advantages of ministerialism; the Left, of the sincere friends of the Charter; and the extreme Left, of

the Republicans, the Radicals, the *insatiable*.

La Bourdayonnaye, who had just retired from office, had pretensions to be considered a leader of the Extreme Right, those paladins of the old *noblesse*, who certainly did more harm than good to the King by their extravagance. What party could be strengthened by a Duplessis-Grénédan, who had loudly demanded the re-establishment of the rack and other barbarities of feudality, and who opposed the law of indemnity because it did not wrench all the fragments of the national domain from the hands of innocent purchasers, and restore the very estates themselves to the old proprietors? By a La Boësière, who deemed it a breach of the oath of allegiance to question the propriety of anything emanating from the Ministers? By a Salaberry, to whom the name of the press or of the Charter, was as water to the subject of hydrophobia? And if others, like Corbière, had more of discretion, talent, or knowledge of the world, they labored under a load of unpopularity, which rendered them of little avail in the present crisis. The *Contre-Opposition*, however, contained men, to whom it is impossible to deny the respect due to integrity and ability, although associated in position with men who were blindly hastening on a new Revolution. Martignac and Hyde de Neuville, independently of their numerous other claims to consideration, had earned a new title to it in being driven from the ministry to make room for the vowed foes of the Charter. MM. de Conny, Delalot, and de Larochefoucauld, with others of their class, might also be singled out from the ranks of the Right, as uniting great personal respectability with a creed, which comprised the Charter and the King, the Bourbons and France. The Right was to derive what aid it might from the Ministers themselves, at least

from such among them as possessed capacity for the business of a deliberative assembly; and how weak they had previously been, in this essential element of a vigorous cabinet, is rendered apparent by their calling Guernon de Ranville from a provincial bar to succeed La Bourdonnaye, on account of the rhetorical powers and supposed parliamentary talent of the former gentleman.

How differently constituted was the Opposition in all the elements of national consideration and the means of exercising popular influence! Since the Three Days their names have become familiar to us by the deeds they have performed, or the speeches they have delivered, in the cause of the Charter. If the Left contained fewer of the old aristocratical families, which the Restoration had given back to France, it was rich in every thing else, and in that respect even was not deficient. If the La Fayettes and the Larochefoucauld-Liancourts, with genealogies running back into eras co-existent with the conquests of the Franks, were not numerous among the Opposition, who, among the *Contre-Opposition*, deserved to be matched with the Royer Collards, the Duponts, the Périers, the Dupins? Here were Firmin Didot, Lefebvre, Jars, Casimir Périer, Lafitte, Balguerie, Ternaux, Laisné de Villevesque, who brought to the deliberations of the Chamber a practical knowledge of the commerce and manufactures of their country, worth all the *sangre azul* in France, and several of them could be as eloquent in the tribune, as they were wise and well-informed in the committee room. Among the great publicists and eminent magistrates were Dupont de l'Eure, exhibiting a life of public usefulness and exalted public virtues in legislative and juridical functions coeval with the Revolution; Méchin, a cotemporary of the last in the length of his public ser-

vices and distinguished for zeal as a debater; Bérenger, a publicist, whom some of the American letter writers have absurdly mistaken for Béranger the poet; Dupin and Mauguin, practising advocates of Paris, equally distinguished at the bar and in the senate; and De Schonen, a counsellor of the Court Royale of Paris, of the highest reputation for talents and patriotism. It is one of the distinctions of science and letters, that they diffuse reputation far beyond the limits of ordinary political notoriety; and Royer Collard, Etienne, Charles Dupin, Kératry, and Benjamin Constant, had more than a single claim to be known, whether in or out of France. Nor should we fail to remember the virtuous Labbey de Pompières, since lost to his country by death; or Louis, who had twice resigned the portfolio of Finance rather than participate in acts injurious to his country, and was now a steady opponent of the government; or Sébastiani and Gérard, the former so well known as a diplomatist, and both as among the great generals of the Empire; or Laborde, eminent as an author and a politician, and not less so as the generous dispenser of a noble fortune, and as a spirited public benefactor.

Little time need be occupied in speaking of the Chamber of Peers, which, from deliberating in private, attracted less of general interest, and has been almost passive in the changes of the Three Days. It contained two very distinct divisions, one of which would gladly have aided M. de Polignac in restoring the good old times, and the other would have preferred to let things remain as they were. It is observable that neither did all the ancient nobles belong to the first class, nor all the *novi homines* to the latter, but singular mixtures had occurred on both sides. Many gentlemen of name and arms had become

reasonable by the influence of reflection and experience. Such were MM. the Ducs de Mortemart, de La Vauguyon, de Choiseul, de Broglie, Doudeauville, the Prince de Talleyrand, the Marquis de Jaucourt, the Vicomte de Châteaubriand, the Comtes de La Ferronays and de Laroche-Aymond, the Marquis de Catelan, the Comtes de Pontecoulant, de Ségur, the Duc de Praslin, and others who justly appreciated the mad schemes of the government. They remembered what the *noblesse* had already lost in the unequal contest of parchment-privileges against force; they foresaw what it would again lose by another such struggle; and they sought to calm, by moderation and prudence, the exaltation and exaggeration of the wild apostles of a royalist revolution. Although sustained by the brilliant cortège of the titled heroes of the Republic and the Empire, by the great functionaries who had been the lights of their time, and who retained in old age the patriotic spirit of their youth,—although efficiently aided by such men, the Mortemarts and Châteaubriands strove in vain to control a suicidal madness of policy, which they knew would work the destruction of the Bourbons, and had reason to fear would prove equally fatal in its consequences to the Chamber of Peers. Of M. de Pastoret, the perpetual President, it is enough to add, that he had well attained his political elevation by a career of meritorious public services, having traversed the Revolution with honor. It was pointedly remarked of him, long before any body anticipated the catastrophe of the Three Days: — 'Il ne nuira jamais de lui-même à l' ordre établi; mais, si on voulait le renverser, il laisserait faire.' The event has very strikingly verified this prediction.

Such was the Legislature, before whom the Ministers were now called upon to account, not

for their measures, but for their existence in office. Anxious expectation filled every mind, and angry discussions were heard in every circle, as to the form in which this great question would come up, and the effect of any hostile demonstration on the part of the Ministers or of the Opposition. Would the Ministers resign if the Address of the Deputies should be against them, and a dissolution of the Chamber ensue? The royalist journals said, no. 'The Address,' they argued, 'is of little consequence: if it is hostile, Ministers will put it in their pockets, and pursue their course as before; they are not persons to retire because they are asked to do so. Let them hold firm; the Address will pass for nothing; and they will have the majority for the budget.' Supposing this to be their course, and the Ministers to disregard the menaces of the Opposition, yet, if the latter should have the majority in the Chamber, what would or ought to be the effect of their refusing the budget? Would the Ministers then yield to the national representatives? Or would the King, indignant at such an interference with his pretended prerogative in the selection of his Ministers, dissolve the Chambers? And if so, would he order a new election, thus making an appeal to the voice of the nation? Or would he undertake a *coup d'état*, in the hope of maintaining his ground by force? These delicate and difficult questions were at length cut short by the unexpected arrival of the national crisis.

CHAPTER II.

Meeting of the Chambers.—Speech of the King.—Address of the Deputies.—Prorogation.—Discussions.—Dissolution of the Chamber.—New Ministers.—Elections.—Algerine Expedition.—State of Algiers.—Cause of the War.—Preparation.—Landing in Algiers.—Colonization of Africa.

The French Chambers assembled on the 2d of March. All France awaited with intense anxiety the result of this the most important legislative meeting which had occurred since the Restoration.

The King's Speech at the opening of the session, after alluding to the probable termination of the negociations regarding Greece and the intended Algerine expedition, and to some minor topics of internal policy, concluded with these words:

'The Charter has placed the public liberties under the safeguard of the rights of my throne. These rights are sacred; my duty is to transmit them entire to my successors. Peers of France and Deputies of Departments, I doubt not of your co-operation in effecting the good which I wish to accomplish. You will repel with contempt the perfidious insinuations, which malevolence endeavors to propagate. If culpable manœuvres should raise up against my government obstacles which I am unable — (he added on recovering himself) which I do not wish — to foresee, I shall find the power of surmounting them in my resolution to maintain the public peace, in my just confidence in the French, and in the love which they have always shown for their Kings.'

In weighing, impartially, these expressions, which occasioned so much heat, excitement and discussion at the time, and which had such a decided effect in precipitating the critical moment, it seems clear that the great error of the Speech was in its mal-adaptation to the sentiments and opinions which then pervaded France. It was little better than mockery to speak of 'the love',

which the French had '*always* shown for their Kings,' in sight of the half finished monument of the Place Louis Quinze, where the statue of Liberty stood within the memory of all men, and where Louis XVI, Marie Antoinette, and Madame Elizabeth perished on the scaffold. It was a compliment to the French no less equivocal, for a Bourbon to pretend a 'just confidence' in them, when they had seized on all occasions to inspire that family with well founded distrust, by killing four of its males within forty years, and only tolerating the residue from dire necessity. And to talk of the 'sacred rights' of a throne, which was, by the confession of the Ministers themselves, already shaken to its foundations by the assaults of revolutionary violence; to propose to place the 'public liberties' under the safeguard of its crumbling fabric; and complacently to hold up the liberties of the people in contrast with the rights of royalty: — all this would have been injudicious at any time, but at the present conjuncture was unspeakably ridiculous. It was, however, the denunciation of the 'perfidious insinuations,' of the 'malevolence,' and of the 'culpable manœuvres' of the Opposition,—and the implied threat in the concluding sentence, which roused the resentment and stimulated the resolution of the Chamber.

The Opposition, feeling entire confidence in carrying with them a decided majority of the Deputies, proposed an Address in reply to the Speech, expressive of their determined purpose. The debates in the French Chamber have always been prone to assume considerable vivacity of manner; but never, since the Restoration, had an occasion arisen, in which the greatness of the stake could better have sanctioned the most earnest appeals of parliamentary eloquence. The Royalists, con-

scious as they must have been of the probable issue, did not abate one jot of their confidence in language. They pretended the Charter was a mere gift of royalty, not a consequence or effect of the Revolution; nay, that it was a voluntary and an unexpected gift. All France, said M. de Conny, is counter-revolutionary, and now asks nothing of the Ministers, but that they shall consolidate the Restoration, combat and destroy the spirit of faction, unite the elements of an aristocratic power, and restore to the Departments their moral life of which they have been deprived. M. Guernon de Ranville contended, that the attack of the Chamber on the royal prerogative exerted in the appointment of his Ministers, was an act of intolerable usurpation and antimonarchial tyranny. But the comfortable assurances of M. de Sainte-Marine were the most edifying. 'The great majority of the population,' said he, 'the third party between the liberal faction and the cabinet, consisting of thirty-two millions of Frenchmen, enjoys the present, confides in the future, loves what exists, is fearful of changes, and knows that a progressive system is a change, as well as a retrograde system. They cherish their King, they love to be governed by him, they repose confidence in his wisdom, and his love for his people. They wait for the acts of the Ministers; and as the only thing that they now know is, that the King has chosen them, his choice is a presumption in their favor, and not a reason for their condemnation.' It is impossible, in any period of history, to find arrogant pretensions more strikingly contrasted with the real state of the facts.

At length the Address was carried against the Ministers, by a vote of two hundred and twenty-one to one hundred and eighty one, and concluded thus:

'Sire, the Charter, which we owe to the wisdom of your august predecessor, and the benefits of which your majesty is firmly resolved to consolidate, consecrates as a right the intervention of the country in the discussion of the public interests. This intervention must be, it is in fact, indirect, wisely measured, circumscribed within limits exactly traced, and which we shall never suffer to be passed; but it is positive in its result, for it makes the permanent agreement of the political views of your government with the wishes of your people an indispensable condition of the regular conduct of public affairs. Sire, our loyalty, our devotedness, condemn us to say that *this agreement does not exist.*

'An anxious distrust of the sentiments and reason of France is now the fundamental idea of the administration. It afflicts your people, because it insults them; it excites their apprehension because it threatens their liberties.

'This distrust cannot approach your noble heart. No, Sire, France no more desires anarchy than you desire despotism. She deserves your faith in her loyalty, as she reposes faith in your promises.

'Between those, who misunderstand a nation so calm, so faithful, — and us, who, with a profound conviction, come to confide to your bosom the sorrows of a people jealous of the esteem and confidence of their King, let the wisdom of your majesty pronounce. Your royal prerogatives have placed in your hands the means of securing between the powers of the State that constitutional harmony, which is the first and necessary condition of the strength of the throne and the grandeur of France.'

The Address by no means expressed, in all its parts, the concurring sentiments of all those who voted for its adoption. Many of them were avowed Republicans, who neither entertained that respect for the Monarch personally, nor for monarchy in the abstract, which is put forward in the Address. But such men were willing to overlook expressions of that kind, and to adopt the whole as a measure of opposition. Had the King been capable at this time, or at any other, of calculating his own position and rightly estimating the disposition of the country, he might undoubtedly have saved his throne for a while, and perhaps transmitted it peaceably to the Dauphin, by mak-

ing the concessions, which the temper of the times demanded at his hands. A change of Ministers, a frank and sincere committing of himself to such objects of public improvement as the liberal party proposed, might have left him the popular King of a great nation, if it deprived him of the dubious honor of being chief of an aristocratic faction. But, with the infatuation of another James II, he rushed headlong on to his own destruction, in spite of the warning voice of wisdom and experience. He immediately communicated to the Deputies his fixed resolution to persist in sustaining the Ministers, and ordered the prorogation of the Chambers to the 1st of September: it being well understood that he intended soon to order a dissolution, thus taking the chances of a new election, or at least procrastinating the contemplated blow at the Charter.

Charles X was now at war with France. The nation had declared, in every form wherein such a resolution could be impressed upon the King, that his government should not go on so long as his present Ministers remained in office; and he had as resolutely declared that he would on no condition relinquish his Ministers. An appeal to arms must even then have been foreseen as the probable, nay, almost the necessary issue of such a contention. But the provisions of the last budget would enable the government to continue in being until the next September, without the aid of a new vote of supplies for the interim, at least so far as to meet the necessary expenses of the State. It is true that the expedition against Algiers required the concurrence of the Chambers; but the Ministers calculated, wisely enough perhaps, that if they carried their main object, of overturning the Charter, they should have no difficulty in disposing of the ob-

jections to any slight irregularity in the plan of the Algerine war. In the grand effort they were making to abridge the liberties of the people, they must, of course, either succeed or fail; there was no middle result. If they succeeded, the power would be in their hands, and all would go smoothly: if they failed, the trifling crime of neglecting one of the forms of law would be swallowed up in the monstrous one of attempting to alter the constitution of government. Until the month of September, therefore, they could avert the final crisis, which they dreaded to meet, as much as they desired it should take place; and thus much time remained to them for essaying the force of intrigue, manœuvre, and corruption, and maturing their plans of eventually entering upon civil war with the prospect of victory.

During the whole period which elapsed before the downfal of the dynasty, the Kingdom was agitated to its very centre by the progress of the expedition against Algiers and the course of the elections for a new Chamber. But discussions of the actual predicament of the Ministers, and of the complexion assumed by this great political question since the presentation of the Address, were not the less unremittedly pursued in the public journals. The same question had arisen in England, it will be remembered, in the reign of George III, when Mr. Pitt was appointed to office against the voice of a majority of the House of Commons. Notwithstanding the vote of the House, demanding his removal, the King adhered firmly to the selection he had made, and treated it as a matter narrowly affecting his prerogative, in the same way as Charles X regarded it in like circumstances. Mr. Pitt also maintained his ground by fair argument, until the sentiment of the nation was with him, and then, and not until

then, advised a dissolution, and the return of a new House of Commons. If Polignac had intended or desired to govern wisely, and to the public satisfaction in the sense of the Charter, he might have adopted the same course not without some hope of success. But, unfortunately for him, his object was to revolutionize the Government; or, as M. de Conny would phrase it, consolidate the Restoration; and, of course, he could not stand upon the Charter, and by moderation and prudence in the conduct of public affairs give the lie to the prediction of the liberals, and thus secure the support of the nation.

But while M. de Polignac might, undeniably, find such a precedent as the remarkable one of Mr. Pitt, to sanction his continuance in office, in spite of an adverse vote of the elective branch of the Legislature; and, if his purposes had been constitutional and fair, might have ventured to repeat the experiment; yet, even in the latter case, such a course would have been wholly indefensible, considering the question as one for a patriotic Minister to decide, with reference to the welfare of his King and his country. It was mere madness to stake the existence of the monarchy itself upon a metaphysical abstraction, a point of transcendental right, not worthy to be weighed an instant of time in the balance with the exigencies of the public service. For, to recur once more to the example of England, whose constitution M. de Polignac said was the study of his life, how often has it happened there that ministers had resigned because they had lost the confidence of Parliament: how often have kings retained in, or appointed to, office, some individual unacceptable to themselves, because he possessed the confidence of Parliament. It is, in fact, the experience of every day.

True, the King by his prerogative, has the

right to select such Ministers as he sees fit, and those Ministers may remain in office, whether they are agreeable to Parliament or not. But, on the other hand, Parliament has just as good an extreme right to reject all the propositions of the Ministers, whether relating to money matters or anything else. The objection to such a procedure, on the part of either, is that the country suffers meanwhile. And with just as much reason as Charles alleged that, to vote against his Ministers as such, was an attack on his prerogative in their appointment, with the same propriety might the Chambers allege that, in demanding of them a vote of supplies whether they had confidence in the Ministers or not, the King was invading their privilege by the Charter. As a question of abstract right, therefore, it was absurd for the King to assume the ground he did; because it should have been considered and decided as a question of public good and of political expediency. Both parties had a right to insist, and each had certainly as good a right to recede. By refusing to yield, the King embarrassed the public business and filled the country with contention, discord, and civil war; by gracefully yielding he would have prevented all this injury to the country, and would have preserved the throne to himself, instead of throwing it away upon an idle punctilio of personal pride.

In mentioning the prorogation of the Chambers, it was stated that the dissolution of the Chamber of Deputies was expected soon to follow. In anticipation of this event, the liberal party had been busy in preparing for a desperate contest. The Ministers appeared to think that the imposing spectacle of the preparations against Algiers was enough to conciliate for them the good will of the electors; and on the 17th of May an ordi-

nance was published dissolving the present Chambers, ordering the meetings of the Electoral Colleges for the 23d of June and the 3d of July, and that of the two Chambers on the 3d of August. 'From this time to the conclusion of the elections,' says Dr Lardner's valuable Retrospect, 'a scene of political activity, and paroxysms of political energy, were exhibited, which are seldom witnessed even in times of revolution. The names of the two hundred and twenty one, who voted the hostile Address, had been published. Their courage and constitutional principles had been applauded to the skies for two months in almost every journal in the Kingdom; and their re-election was now called for, not only as a reward for their patriotism, but as a defiance of their enemies. Manuals of the electoral laws were printed by a liberal association in all the liberal papers, and purposely scattered among all the electors of the Provinces. The Committee for managing the elections in Paris sent around their lists of candidates for all the Electoral Colleges. Committees were also formed in every Department or Electoral District, to watch the proceedings of the Prefects and other agents of government, to examine the lists of electors, to restore the names of persons who had a right to vote, to detect fraud or imposition in those who had not, and to prosecute before the tribunals all infractions of the electoral laws by the aid or through the connivance of the administration. The ministry, on their side, were equally active; but their efforts were totally inefficient against the overwhelming force of their adversaries.'

It is inconceivable what infatuation of mind could have induced the Court, at this time, to remodel the cabinet, and especially to introduce the individuals, who now entered into it. M. de

Courvoisier could hardly be suspected of revolutionary tendencies, and his pliability of character would have been likely to keep him in the traces with his fellow-ministers. But it seems that M. de Polignac could not trust him for the desperate effort that was now to be made. An ill-regulated sentiment of devotion to the party of the Jesuits, was the assigned cause of his having so long adhered to the court-interest, notwithstanding his supposed attachment to constitutional principles. It has been said that he might take for his device, 'Liberté et Loyola;' and perhaps M. de Polignac feared lest Courvoisier should allow the former predilection to get the better of the last, in view of the ardent zeal of all France for maintaining the Charter. 'Courvoisier,' said a liberal writer in August, 1829, 'is good at bottom; appearances only are against him; ambition has induced him to commit an error, for which his conscience pricks him continually; and I should not be surprised if he had a falling out with his colleagues, and retired of his own accord if he was not obliged to do it by others.' M. Chantelauze, a man new to high official station, but recommended to Polignac, it would seem, for that which Courvoisier wanted, was appointed to supercede him in the custody of the Seals. A new ministry was at the same time created for Baron Capelle, that of Public Works.

But these appointments were of comparatively minor consequence, considering the nature of one other made in the place of M. de Chabrol. This gentleman had remained in office during so many changes, that it was reproachfully said of him that he had a mania for devouring office, and so it was but an office, it mattered little to him what kind of one it was or whence it came. He possessed those convenient talents, which, united

with general probity of character and considerable administrative capacity, enabled him to hold place in successive but very different cabinets. But his good fortune drove him seasonably from this, and preserved him from a further participation in its treasonable designs. M. de Polignac, in providing a substitute, was determined, one would think, to have a man as unpopular as himself, hardly less odious than Bourmont, and equally harsh and violent in his politics with La Bourdonnaye; in order that, as La Bourdonnaye had resigned, and Bourmont was to command the African army, he (M. de Polignac) might not stand 'alone in his glory.' Accordingly, he selected M. de Peyronnet, who had served through M. de Villèle's seven years as the *ame damnée* of 'the deplorable ministry;' and who was not less obnoxious to censure on account of his personal deportment than his official conduct. To adopt Peyronnet as a coadjutor was a sort of desperate defiance of public opinion, an outrage upon the feelings of the nation. It was equivalent to declaring on the part of Charles, that he and France being now irreconcilably at issue, it was no matter how unscrupulous in purpose or unpopular in reputation his agents may be, so they were prepared to enter into, and able to assist in, his plan for subverting the Charter.

M. de Peyronnet was created Minister of the Interior, such changes being made among the other members of the cabinet as to admit him to this post. The immediate object of the arrangement was to bring into action his vigor of purpose, his activity, and his unshrinking readiness to go all lengths, in the hope that by means of these qualities he might be able to influence the pending elections His office brought him into immediate contact with the multitude of executive

agents, who are employed in the internal government of France; and it was upon this point that all his energies were concentrated, so as to spare no efforts of the government to procure a ministerial majority in the new Chamber. In furtherance of this object, the Ministers addressed circulars to the *employés* in their respective Departments, requiring of them to purchase a continuance in office by blind devotion to their chiefs, and thus openly setting at naught the whole theory of the Charter, which gave to every man the right of voting according to the dictates of his conscience, without accountability therefor to the government. Nay, a proclamation was addressed to the people in the King's name, with a view to overawe the Electoral Colleges, but which had the effect of adding new stimulus to the excited feelings of the liberal party, or rather of the great body of the nation, for the two expressions are convertible.

Notwithstanding, therefore, all the unconstitutional efforts and humbling manœuvres of the government to break down the freedom of elections, their intrigues failed of the intended effect, and the result of the ballot was a signal triumph of the Constitutionalists. Owing to a great number of disputed cases growing out of the method allowed by law for ascertaining the correctness of the electoral lists, the elections could not all be accomplished on the days originally fixed for that purpose, and the 12th and 19th of July were appointed for their completion. When the returns were all received, it appeared that forty-nine persons were added to the liberal representation, the numbers standing, two hundred and seventy, to one hundred and forty-five, without taking into consideration, upon either side, fifteen who remained questionable. More than two hundred

of the old members, who voted the famous Address, were re-elected, although the whole force of royal indignation and royal vengeance was directed especially against them; and France stood thus directly pledged, as it were, and committed, past redemption, to the principles of that Address.

This triumph of the liberal party was the more signal, inasmuch as it was effected, not by the agency of a turbulent democracy of the poor and dependent classes of men, who might be accused, however unjustly, of levelling principles and feelings. In France, the representation was based altogether upon property. By the complicated system of the Electoral Colleges, the election was altogether in the hands of the richer citizens, or at least the poorer classes were excluded from any direct participation in the elective franchise. The qualification was territorial, being the payment of 300 francs annually *in direct taxes;* and a comparison of this with our own system will enable every one to judge of its operation. Nor is this all. The great proprietors were allowed a *double vote;* that is, they voted in two separate Colleges, by virtue of one of the ingenious arrangements of past Ministers for throwing all power into the hands of the aristocracy. Two sets of Electoral Colleges existed, the Colleges of Arrondissements, which returned two hundred and fifty four Deputies, and the Colleges of Departments, which returned the remaining one hundred and seventy six. Of the same individuals, who composed the Colleges of Arrondissements, and who voted in them, one quarter part, namely, the quarter paying the highest tax, afterwards formed themselves into Colleges of Departments, and there choose additional Deputies. Thus the richest nobles and commoners exclusively elected two-fifths of the Chamber, and the same individu-

als participated with the other property holders in electing the remaining three fifths; this being in effect like the system in England by which a person may have a double vote, first in the election of Borough members and afterwards in that of County members, although different from the English system in form. It will be comprehended at once by means of an application to our own institutions. Suppose that of twelve members of Congress in Massachusetts, eight were elected by the votes of all proprietors having an income of 600 dollars per annum, and that the richest quarter part of the same electors chose the remaining four members; and that the systems were uniform throughout the United States. We shall thus understand the nature of the double vote and the anti-democratic theory of the elections, about which the liberal party in France have so justly complained; and we shall the better appreciate the extent of the victory they gained at this time over the Ministers.

The conduct of the French elections presented a remarkable contrast to what might be seen in England on like occasions. In France, there was, it may be well supposed, abundance of zeal, and no want of vivacity of discussion or feeling; but we may look in vain for any traces of the wholesale system of bribery and corruption, which disgraces the elections in England. In the latter country, under the reign of rotten boroughs and aristocratic influence, if the franchise was held by a few persons, — by the burgage tenants, the corporation, the inhabitants paying scot and lot, the *pot-wallopers*, or any other combination, whether a rational or irrational one, of a small number of individuals, — they of course received their *consideration*, their *quid pro quo*, for the representative they very kindly sent to the House of

Commons. If the number of voters happened to be large, they might view a contested election as a source of profit, and we have seen in the recent case of Liverpool how reckless they felt even as to the external decencies of corruption, if decencies it can be said to possess in any circumstances. But while scenes of frantic mob-fury, or of impudent undisguised bribery too frequently characterized the English elections, in France a picture of a far different kind was presented to the eye. The electors do not invite candidates to appear and contend for their votes, in France, in order that large sums of money may be presented to or expended among them; but, on the contrary, it has repeatedly happened that the same individual had been cotemporaneously returned by several distinct Colleges. In fact, during the long struggle between the liberal and royalist parties, the decorousness and purity displayed in the exercise of the elective franchise by the French, when compared with the violence and corruption, the treating, feasting, and bribery attending it in England, afford a sufficient answer to the English sciolists, who have so often pretended that their continental neighbors were unprepared for the enjoyment of liberty.

It should be remembered that during the whole period of the elections, and the several months that preceded them, all France had been dazzled and animated by the preparations for the expedition against Algiers, and the movements of the African army; but wholly without producing the effect anticipated by the Ministers. And such was the singular fortune of the Bourbons, that in the last month of their expiring power, in the very July of the Revolution, they were destined to obtain by conquest an accession to the territories of France, which even in the days of her departed

glory might have been considered highly important. For it is not a mere barren rock on the Mediterranean, like Malta or Gibraltar, which France has acquired in the capture of Algiers, but an extensive dominion in the most fertile regions of the continent of Africa.

We are prone to think of Algiers, in common with the other Barbary States, as only a nest of pirates at perpetual war with Christendom. The quality of those relations, which European powers have had with the masters of the Mediterranean shore of Africa, might well leave such impressions on the mind, were we not careful to recal, by an exertion of memory, the past condition of that part of the inhabited globe, and its actual capabilities. It is but opening the book of history to find the populous Carthage, the capital of a great African Empire, reaching Spain, Sicily, and Sardinia in its dominion or influence, and yielding only to the irresistible genius of Rome. To judge of the commerce of the Carthaginians we must consider that there is every reason to believe they had circumnavigated Africa, returning to the Mediterranean by Egypt, and that it is by no means certain they did not find their way across the Western Ocean. When Northern Africa had ceased to be the rival, it became one of the granaries, of Rome; and was a wealthy and populous region, when the Vandals, in the fifth century, having left their name to half of Spain, crossed the sea, and founded a Gothic Kingdom in ancient Carthage, whence the barbarian Genseric sent forth his expeditions to ravage and sack the Eternal City, and the miserable towns of Italy and Greece. If Belisarius restored Africa to the Empire again, it was but to prepare it to fall into the hands of another band of half civilized conquerors, the Arabs, who made it that which it has since been

in modern times. Happily their invasions of Christendom, their long occupation of Spain and parts of France and Sicily, — for even in the latter countries traces of their presence still remain, — and even their sway in Africa itself, have gradually given way before the fortunes of Europe.

Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli, it is known, have long had substantially the same political condition, being each the capital of a considerable territory, nominally subject to the Porte, as the great head of the Mussulman Empire, but possessing much real independence. Preferring piracy to the lawful means of gain which navigation affords, Algiers, especially, has long been the scourge and the terror of the Mediterranean; and by the strength of its position and other natural advantages, had been able to defy even the resources and the military talents of Charles the Fifth. The various Christian nations which occupied the shores of the Mediterranean, or who visited that sea for the purposes of commerce, continued for two or three hundred years to submit to the payment of a disgraceful tribute to the Dey as the price of exemption from ravage or capture, which did not prevent the Algerines from being almost constantly at variance with one or another power, and thus having a pretext for plundering at sea or on land, and making captives to be reduced to a state of slavery. The principle on which this tribute was demanded seems to have had precedents among several of the European nations, much as we are accustomed to regard it with horror as one of the peculiarities of African and Moorish barbarism. The *black mail*, which the novel of Waverly has rendered so familiar to the admirers of Sir Walter Scott's works, seems to have been strikingly similar to the Barbary tribute. And the Sound Dues, paid in pass-

ing Elsineur to enter the Baltic, rest on no better foundation; being originally a composition exacted in the same way by the rulers of those who ravaged the north of Europe, as the Barbary cruisers did the south, and being now little better than a mere gratuitous tribute, continuing to be paid when it no longer is a consideration for exemption from pillage. But the Algerines, in applying to men of European and African stocks indiscriminately, the doctrine in regard to personal servitude, which Europeans would prefer to have exclusively applied to Africans, have gained quite their due share of odium in the eyes of Europe; and the piratical insolence and contempt of right, which so generally characterized their conduct, have at length in our own times drawn down upon them the merited indignation of the great maritime powers, and thus finally led to the extinction of the Regency of Algiers as an independent sovereignty.

The United States having commenced the task of bringing these sea robbers to reason, Great Britain and the Netherlands speedily followed our example; and her depredations upon the ships and citizens of a portion of Christianity were thus checked. But Algiers continued to receive tribute from various quarters, either directly *eo nomine*, or in the shape of diplomatic presents; and abated but little of her insolence towards the nations, which condescended to temporize with or submit to her barbaric policy. This subject, like the general question of African slavery, has received the attention of various of those European Congresses of the last fifteen years, which assume the right of setting up and pulling down the weaker States, parcelling out provinces at will, and making or unmaking kings, under various specious pretexts, of consulting the peace, tranquil-

lity, or welfare of Europe. But it better suited the convenience of the Holy Alliance to make war with Freedom, than to unite in putting down Barbarism. Fortunately, the hereditary conspirators against the rights of mankind have received, and are in the course of receiving, their meet reward, in the revolutionary movements, which have shaken their thrones; and their mutual jealousies, which would not sanction any joint effort to chastise the Moors, have suffered Algiers to pass under the dominion of France.

At the time when the expedition to Africa was planned, war had already existed between France and Algiers for the space of nearly three years. It arose out of a trifling incident, so far as regards the immediate cause of it, although afterwards very weighty reasons of another kind were adduced in its justification. Algiers possessed claims on France for supplies of grain furnished to the Republic. We can judge for our own share, whether it was likely to be an easy matter for the Dey to obtain a liquidation of these claims. The European nations have very peculiar notions as to international law, maritime rights, and so forth. England, France, Spain, Holland, Naples, — all thought it an insufferable grievance to be despoiled by Algiers, when they were at peace with her, of a few hundreds, where each of them, with not a tittle more of right, has despoiled the United States of as many thousands, on the great highway of nations. Probably the Dey used to have some learned cavil of prize law, or at any rate some convenient ordinance emanating from his own good pleasure, to justify his depredations; and on what better right have our citizens been robbed of so many millions of money by those powers, which pride themselves upon their civilization, and their superiority in national equi-

ty over the descendants of the Numidians?—Again, the Dey undoubtedly, although he had no exchequer tallies, nor kept so much as a register of his receipts and expenses, yet believed that nations ought to pay their debts as well as individuals, and probably saw no good reason why the liquidation of a just claim should be put off for twenty years; and we Americans can sympathize in the feelings he entertained, that in such matters a very odd system of national morals has obtained in Europe. For thus it was with the claims in question, of Algiers upon France. Some years after the Restoration, a commission examined the matter, and awarded the sum of seven millions of francs to the Algerine creditors of France; but the French government saw fit to impound the money to meet some alleged claims of its citizens against the Algerines.

In this state of things, the Dey, weary of attempting in vain to obtain justice by means of the French consul, wrote himself to the King of France, through the consul of a common friend. This application remaining for some time unnoticed, produced extreme irritation in the mind of the Dey. When M. Duval, the French consul, presented himself before the Dey in full divan, in April of 1827, on occasion of the festivities of the Bairam, the Dey embraced the opportunity to enquire why his letters were not answered. 'My master,' replied the consul, 'has no answer to make to a man like you.' This, most assuredly, was an extraordinary reply to be given to the Sovereign of the country, by a foreign consul residing there by the favor of that Sovereign; and the Dey was so highly incensed, that he lost his presence of mind, and struck the consul a blow with his fan. Indeed, the French accounts of the transaction deny that M. Duval employed the expression ascribed

to him; and aver that the wrong was wholly on the side of the Dey. Reparation was demanded for the insult to France in the person of her representative and agent; and this being refused, or at least not being offered in terms satisfactory to France, she declared war against the Regency, and commenced the blockade of Algiers. The war had lingered on for three years, nothing more than the blockade having been attempted in all that time. The Villèle and Martignac ministries had been loath to come to close quarters by making an actual attack upon the fortifications of Algiers, — an enterprise in which so many had failed, and where defeat would redound in such deplorable disgrace and mortification. But other feelings now animated M. de Polignac and his colleagues.

M. de Polignac, as before hinted, unquestionably thought to divert public attention from his despotic measures by the brilliant spectacle of martial preparation and triumph. He expected to gain popularity for his administration by flattering the military pride of the nation; and he might feel not without hope thus to awaken some little spirit in favor of the Bourbons, should the expedition be attended with victories and final success. Whether he went so far as to suppose he might thus get a disposable force under arms to assist him in bearing down the people, may be doubted; because, if he possessed the least forethought, he must have seen that the crisis would pass before any troops, however obsequious their disposition, and however rapid their movements, could be brought from Algiers to act against Paris. And undoubtedly M. de Bourmont, a brave man and able officer, might look to this occasion, as the means of acquiring military reputation sufficient to neutralize some part of the odium

attached to his name; and he would therefore exert all his influence in the cabinet to urge on the expedition, of which, as it subsequently appeared, he was to have the command.

At the same time, the government did not seek to disguise from themselves the difficulties and dangers of the expedition. No pains were spared to obtain all possible information from every quarter, domestic or foreign, which books or individuals could communicate. All the energies of the country, intellectual and pecuniary, were put in requisition to insure success. In the first place, the Minister of War himself, M. de Bourmont, was made commander-in-chief, and Admiral Duperré, the first naval officer of the Kingdom, was joined with him to lead the naval forces. A numerous army, with appointments on a magnificent scale, a large and powerful fleet, and the whole apparatus of war fitted to the present state of military experience, were to be conducted by officers of tried skill and acknowledged merit.

Indeed, the nature and extent of these preparations may be judged of by the language of the liberal party at different times. When the campaign was first seriously talked of by the government, it was strenuously and loudly condemned by the Opposition, as a Quixotic enterprise against an African barbarian, which would probably fail, and would be of no permanent advantage if it succeeded. They dwelt upon the failure of other expeditions against Algiers, as affording too sure a presage of the fate of this. It was almost impossible, they said, to effect a landing, owing to the tempestuous character of the seas along the Algerine coast, the nature of the shore, and the facilities for opposing the disembarcation of an invading army. If a landing was effected, the soil afforded no forage for horses or supplies for

men, and the troops would be consumed by the burning heats of Africa, amid the harassing attacks of the Moors and Arabs, who were habituated to the climate, and would have control of all the resources of the country. It was confidently predicted, therefore, that the French would either never effect a landing, or, if they did, would be unable to reach Algiers by land. On the other hand, if the attack should be conducted by sea, as was done by the English under Lord Exmouth, the fleet, they said, would have to encounter a thousand difficulties from the elements, as the blockading squadron had already.

And after all, what permanent good would be accomplished by the bombardment of Algiers? The Dey would be reduced to submission, perhaps killed or deposed: but what then? A horde of pirates, like the Barbary corsairs, renegados and wild Turks, without principles, calculation, or public responsibility, could not be cured of their lawless habits by the same remedies, which applied to the European governments. So that France was about to lavish her treasures and the blood of her sons upon a forlorn and chimerical attempt, which had no better inducement than a trifling insult inflicted on a French consul, who had fairly earned it by his impertinence.

Such was the cry of the Paris newspapers at the commencement of the preparations; and the English journals kept up the same croaking tone to the last, for reasons to be adverted to hereafter. But the French changed their tone, when they found how admirably and effectually every thing was arranged for victory. The Opposition then began to reproach the Ministers with the idle expense of such profuse and excessive preparations. They contrasted the *matériel* of this expedition with the great undertakings of Napoleon, — scof-

fing at the inferiority of Bourmont, who, instead of seeking to accomplish great objects by the powerful combinations of military genius, had trusted nothing to skill or chance or talent, but was determined to crush a single city with mighty forces adequate to the subjugation of an empire. It was apparent that the Opposition took a double pleasure in reflecting thus upon the comparative inferiority of the Bourbons in military fame; doing it both to annoy the Ministers, and to counteract the impression the latter had expected to make on the popular mind by the expedition, and at the same time to lower and degrade the reigning dynasty.

To most of these biting sarcasms on their measures the Ministers made no other reply, than to continue their preparations on such a scale as at all events to conquer. This they were determined to do, whatever might be said. But to another part of the subject they gave an answer of a different kind. They were unwilling, it seems, to let the expedition rest merely on the ground of a blow given to a commercial agent, — and put forth an elaborate declaration, setting up a long succession of wrongs and grievances as the permanent justificatory causes of the war. They alleged, among other things, that France possessed certain qualified territorial rights by a compact older than the Revolution, and that of these rights the French were now debarred by the Dey. Spoliations of French property on the high seas, of course, could be found at any time, if that were needed as cause of war against Algiers. But the Ministers, not content with making the Dey answerable to France for his acts against the French, brought forward another ground of quarrel, in the depredations of Algerine corsairs upon property of subjects of the Papal States; — which Charles

seemed to think he was called upon to avenge as a duty of religion to the head of the Catholic Church. In short, what with the unatoned for injuries of the last three years, and other grudges of an older date, there was certainly no want of good reasons for the war, considering the subject in relation to the national honor and dignity of France. How largely it served her interest the result will show.

At length all the forces of the expedition were assembled in Toulon, ready for departure. The army consisted of 37,877 men of all arms, 400 large transports having been engaged for the conveyance of the troops, horses, munitions, provisions, and so forth, to Africa. The military marine was not less imposing, being composed of eleven ships of the line, twenty-four frigates, seven corvettes, twenty brigs, and seven steamboats, besides bomb vessels and others of small dimensions: — making, together with the troops, a total force of 65,000 men. This magnificent fleet, with the powerful armament it conveyed, set sail from Toulon on the 25th of May, in presence of vast crowds of spectators, collected on the heights to view the splendid spectacle. The first division of the fleet came in sight of the coast of Africa in five days afterwards; but the ships having been separated by a storm, orders were given to sail to Palma in Majorca, the place provided for rendezvous in anticipation of the event which had occurred. The expedition setting sail again the 9th of June, reached the coast of Africa on the 13th, and proceeded five leagues west of Algiers to the bay of Torre Chica or Sidi Ferruch, which had been selected as the place of disembarking. The French had always supposed that they should find the coast lined with troops prepared to dispute their landing; and they expected this from a

conseiousness that the enemy might easily make a stand there to great advantage. But the Dey had, in the blindness of his obstinaey, calculated otherwise; and left the French unmolested, at the very time when his exertions should have been the greatest. Early on the 14th, the disembarcation of the troops and munitions was commenced, and continued without interruption until the 17th, when a violent tempest arose, and justified a singular precaution taken to meet such a contingency. The packages, sacks, barrels, and so forth, had been covered with a double water proof envelope, so that, if occasion required, they might be thrown into the sea and washed on shore by the waves uninjured. The plan was put in operation at this time with the happiest effeet, and enabled the army to receive supplies from the fleet, in the midst of a hurricane, which rendered all ordinary communieation with the shore utterly impossible.

The French were impatient for action, and advanced without loss of time to attack a body of the Dey's troops, which was entrenched at Staweli, about midway between Sidi Ferruch and Algiers. The position was easily earried, although not without some considerable loss in killed and wounded. Meanwhile the French were obliged to wait ten days for the arrival of their battering train, preparatory to marching on the city; and they were attacked in their turn on the 24th. On this occasion a son of General Bourmont received a dangerous wound, of which he afterwards died. In his despatch the General touchingly alluded to this event in the following words: 'One officer has been dangerously wounded: he is the second of four sons who followed me to Africa. I hope he may survive, to eontinue his serviees to his King and his country:' — Expressions which

are said to have drawn tears of unaffected sensibility from the King. For several days the French continued to suffer from the assaults of the Turkish and African troops; but on the 29th their field-pieces arrived, and they set forward to the attack of a fortress commanding Algiers, called the Emperor's Castle. On the 30th of June the trenches were opened; and the construction of the batteries continued from the 1st to the 3d of July. During this time the fleet co-operated by firing upon the fortifications contiguous to the sea, so as to afford the Dey employment on that side, and prevent his concentrating all his forces for the defence of the Château de l'Empéreur. So much despatch was used by the French in constructing the batteries, that by the morning of the 4th everything was ready, and a fire was opened on the enemy at four o'clock, and briskly returned from the castle for the space of four hours, after which the firing of the latter nearly ceased. At ten o'clock a breach was effected in the defences of the castle, and the Turks abandoned it, having first taken measures, by the Dey's order, to set fire to the powder magazine, which exploded with a tremendous crash, blowing up a part of the fortress, and filling the air with flames, dust, and stones. The sound was heard at sea to the distance of sixty miles, and the shock filled the city and fleet with consternation. No injury, however, was sustained by the besieging troops, which immediately took possession of the smoking ruins, and thus decided the fate of the city, which was now completely at the mercy of the French.

Seeing all resistance vain, and only calculated to produce effusion of blood and the inevitable destruction of the city, the Dey sent a flag of truce to Admiral Duperré, who referred him to General Bourmont as commander-in-chief. The proposi-

tion was to indemnify France for the expenses of the war, and to restore the possessions claimed by her on the coast; but General Bourmont cut short all negociations at once, by demanding the immediate surrender of the Casauba or Palace of the Dey, the fort and all the fortifications, and assuring the messenger that nothing else would save the city from bombardment by sea and land. The Dey was not long in agreeing to the terms of capitulation offered him, and hostilities were suspended until the morning, that the conditions might be explained to his council. On the 5th of July, accordingly, the convention was ratified, and the French took quiet possession of Algiers. The Dey was allowed to retire with his family and private property, to any place out of Africa that he might select; as also were his Turkish militia; and the protection of the French was assured to them so long as they remained in Algiers. All the other inhabitants of the Regency were promised security for their persons and property, and the unmolested enjoyment of their religion; and the General engaged upon his honor to respect their women. And thus the whole of Algiers, after having so long been a by-word of horror throughout Christendom, passed quietly under the dominion of France.

Exaggerated reports had been current respecting the treasure of the Regency, which rumor had raised to the sum of 200,000,000 of francs; and immediate search was made for it on taking possession of the Casauba. The French were greatly disappointed to find only 48,684,527 francs in gold and silver bullion or coin, and 5,000,000 of francs in merchandize; and, as no regular accounts were kept by the Dey, it was impossible to ascertain how much, if any, had been removed or secreted. It is singular that nothing is said of any

jewels or precious stones as forming part of the treasure; and perhaps the Dey and his counsellors took care to enrich themselves with these more portable representatives of wealth, leaving to the French only the bulkier riches in ingots and merchandize. In addition to which, we are to reckon the value of the shipping and munitions of war captured, including 1542 pieces of artillery, and we shall thus have a total of 60,000,000 of francs, as the whole amount of the booty obtained in Algiers. This proved more than amply sufficient to defray all the expenses of the expedition, leaving the acquisition of Algiers a clear gain, in addition to the honor acquired by the conquest, and the breaking up of this great resort of African piracy.

It is to be supposed, and indeed most earnestly hoped, that Algiers will permanently continue to be a possession of France. This question occasioned great agitation in that country previous to the Three Days, owing to the reciprocal jealousy of the French and English nations. The rumor generally received was, that the Duke of Wellington had demanded explanations of M. de Polignac on this point, and had received assurances that France did not contemplate the subjugation of Algiers with a view to retaining it. If such assurances were demanded and given, it would serve to show great pusillanimity of spirit in Polignac, or rather perhaps his expectation that he might need the aid of England. But Polignac, it has been affirmed since then, replied as became his country, that France, when insulted, required not the assistance of others to avenge her wrongs, nor their advice in disposing of any conquest she might make in Africa. And the very suggestion of such a thing, as the surrender of Algiers in the event of its being taken, occasioned, at that

time, paroxysms of rage and indignation all over France. What? said they: Shall England go on acquiring one kingdom after another by force or fraud in Asia, by mere tricks of diplomacy, by engaging in wars of conquest on the most frivolous pretexts, by fomenting disorders in the bosom of independent states, and then assisting the weaker party with her arms to put down the stronger, and thus usurping the control of affairs, in short, by employing every instrument of art or violence to bring millions after millions within the sway of her already overgrown Indian Empire? Can England do this and shall not France attack the outlaws of Algiers in a true and lawful quarrel, and take possession of their justly forfeited territory?— England is continually stretching her chain of colonies or factories along the coasts of Africa, wherever she can find or make an opening, and has obtained by conquest from a European state a vast territory of indefinite extent at one end of the Continent; and must France, to gratify her grasping ally, condescendingly decline to plant a colony at the other end of it? Nay, should England be justified in gaining possession of Gibraltar, Malta, and the Ionian Isles, and thus having a line of strong holds as it were along the Mediterranean, to furnish her with means of annoyance and vexation to the Mediterranean powers; and could not one of those very powers themselves venture to retain, after having lawfully acquired, a single new possession on the shores of the Mediterranean? These were the questions every where asked, when the subject of English interference in this matter was agitated; and the French had ample reason to speak in the language of resentment and wounded pride; for nothing could exceed the tone of overweening self-sufficiency, which characterized the remarks of some

of the most respectable London journals in reference to the Algerine expedition, except the similar tone, which journals of the same political class are prone to employ in speaking of the United States.

The simple truth is, that England has imbibed a strange idea, that no power is ever to extend its possessions excepting herself. From the moment the expedition to Algiers began to be talked of, the English periodicals displayed a fidgety anxiety on the subject, that would have been ludicrous, but for the unfair spirit, and false principles and views, which it betrayed. Every obstacle to the success of the war, all the storms of the African coast, the impracticable nature of the country, the amazing strength of the city of Algiers, with dark forebodings as to the fate of the forlorn Frenchmen, who were about to leave their homes to perish amid the deserts of Barbary, — such were the constant topics of the English newspapers. And of course, they said, France would not presume to think of making a permanent conquest; she would not dare without the approbation of England; and England would never consent that her rival should make any territorial acquisitions. Perhaps, if Charles X had continued in power, he might not have presumed or dared to enjoy the advantages, which a righteous cause and the fortunes of war had placed in his hands. But times are now changed; and France, probably, would no more hear to any remonstrances of England on the subject of Algiers, than if King William should propose to reclaim all that Henry of Monmouth gained, or his son lost, in the heart of France itself. England manifested the same weakness or nervous irritability in regard to our acquisition of the Floridas; but we have abided the murmurings of her journalists, with as little

scathe as they have inflicted on the French in regard to Algiers.*

We, as Americans, can easily see that not only France herself is to derive advantage from her retaining possession of the whole territory of the Regency, and colonizing it as a French settlement, but Northern Africa may hail it as the dawn of her restoration to the advantages of civilization, and the world in general have a right to view it as an auspicious event. It may excite the commercial jealousy of England, who is not particularly unwilling to have the monopoly of all foreign markets, and the exclusive privilege of establishing colonies, factories, and military posts along the coasts of Europe and Asia, Africa and America. But for that very consideration it is important to us and to all other commercial nations that France should extend her commerce and strengthen her marine, in order that England may never again recover that overwhelming maritime ascendancy, which, previous to the last war, encouraged her to such extraordinary abuse of power in the oppression of neutral nations. To those, who remember the nautical history of England for the last forty years, and who have observed the great increase and prosperous condition of the French military marine at the present

*The Foreign Quarterly Review speaks of this point in terms of commendable candor. 'If,' says that journal, 'the colonial aggrandisement of one nation were to be held as furnishing others with any just ground of complaint or interposition, in what situation would Great Britain be placed by the recognition of such a doctrine? Having added empire to empire and kingdom to kingdom, until a hundred and fifty millions of men have submitted to her sway in different quarters of the globe, is it for this country to maintain that colonial aggrandisement affords any just title to one nation for complaining or of interfering with the affairs of another?—Fr. Q. Rev. v. ix, p. 174.

time, this will appear to be no unimportant aspect of the subject. And the advantage, which all mankind are to derive from the seas being forever cleared of the lawless Barbary cruisers, is too evident to require illustration or proof.

But as to Africa, so long given up to the dominion of roving savages, — for what better are the wild Arabs? — so long known to us only as the *officina servorum* for all nations, — so long debarred of the blessings of Christianity and of its handmaiden civilization, what may not Africa reasonably expect from the establishment of an extensive French colony upon her Mediterranean shore? She may look, in the first place, to see the renovation of a portion of the agricultural wealth, the population, and the commerce of ancient Mauritania. And when the Numidians have been tamed by the authority of France, the interior of Africa will become accessible to the researches of intelligence and the progress of improvement. Hitherto the exertions of beneficence have been directed to the western shores of Africa; and those exertions have been imperfectly successful under the burning skies of the line, along a shore fatal to Europeans, by reason of the qualities of its climate, and among hostile tribes brutified by the effects of the slave trade. A broad *cordon* of malignant influences, drawn out along this unhappy coast, has obstructed the efforts of humanity. But place a European people in Barbary, and circumstances change. France will have the power, from this vantage ground, to push the innumerable benefits of European refinement into the heart of Africa. She will have the power, and should have the inclination, to do all this; but whether she has the inclination or not, if she retains Algiers, the mere indirect influence of her presence cannot fail to be serviceable. Consid-

erations, therefore, of the highest nature, exhort her by all means to make good her footing in Algiers, even if it were not for her own great and immediate advantage.

And judging according to all the ordinary rules of human action, it is not to be presumed that France will voluntarily relinquish her hold on a conquest fairly acquired, and which it is for the general good of mankind she should retain, when the strongest inducements of her own individual interest are in unison with every thing but the hypocondriacal apprehensions of England. Here is a rich and fertile territory, within three days' sail of Marseilles, fitted to produce all those vegatable treasures, which render the West Indies such a mine of wealth. France has been gradually stripped of one colony after another, until a few settlements in America are nearly all she retains. England has robbed her of her colonial possessions in the Indian seas, and of the Canadas. She was compelled to sell Louisiana to us as the only means of rescuing it from a like fate. Hayti slipped off her authority during one of the fever fits of the Revolution. In Algiers she may found a colony calculated in some measure to indemnify her for her manifold losses of this description. And the arrangements begun by General Bourmont, and continued by his successors, General Clausel and the Duc de Rovigo, all point to the permanent possession of the country. The Dey was conveyed to Italy in a French ship, and the Turkish troops were also removed; the tributary chiefs and local governors formerly subject to the Dey were notified that the French had assumed the entire authority of their late master; and courts of justice, with all the other incidents of regular government, were established in due form, analagous to the practice of the British in

Hindostan. General Clausel having discovered a refractory disposition in the Bey of Titery, a valuable dependency of Algiers situated in the interior of the country at the foot of Mount Atlas, very speedily brought the Turk to reason by despatching against him a body of French troops, who took possession of his capital, and sent him prisoner to France. Everything, in fine, has indicated the intention of the government to consult the wishes of the whole nation, in the disposition to be made of their new conquest in Africa.

CHAPTER III.

Consequences of the Fall of Algiers.—Ministerial Arrangements.—State of Parties.—The Ordinances.—Their Effect.—Protest of Journalists.—State of the Question.—Protest of the Deputies.—Police Arrangements.

Intelligence of the capture of Algiers was conveyed to Toulon in about sixty hours by a steamboat, and thence by the line of telegraphs to Paris, where it arrived on the 9th of July. The King immediately ordered *Te Deum* to be celebrated throughout France, and he himself attended the service in the cathedral church of *Nôtre Dame*. A kind of vertiginous madness appears to have seized on the King, the Dauphin, and the Ministers, from that hour. Elated with extravagant feelings of triumph, they deemed themselves sure of the same easy victory over the people, that they had achieved over the flying Bedouins of the desert. An absurd confidence in the support of the army, an almost insane audacity of

purpose, an extraordinary delusion as to the spirit, and temper, and power of resistance, and organization of the nation, all conspired to hurry on the weak Prince and his headlong advisers to swift destruction. In the course of four or five days which followed the arrival of the news from Africa, the Ministers wrought up their courage to the requisite degree of strength, on the faith of their late success in war, and resolved upon those memorable infringements of the Charter, which were to precipitate the King from his throne. It is said that M. Guernon de Ranville and M. de Peyronnet were the last to yield their assent to the meditated *coup d'état*. They had confidence in their ability as public speakers, and were long disposed to try the effect of discussion in the Chambers. But M. de Polignac proved to be the evil genius of the monarchy; for he, who had originally been alone in the nefarious project of overturning the constitution, now succeeded in bringing all his associates into the views of himself, and of the irresponsible advisers, who governed the King.

If they had been a revolutionary committee of old regicides, plotting the assassination of Charles and his family, they could not have conducted their operations with more of guilty stealth and elaborate secrecy. The composition of the Ordinances, and of the Report to the King, or justificatory memoir, by which they were to be accompanied, was not only executed by them, but even all the transcribing was performed by them, so that no clerk or amanuensis should have it in his power to divulge the portentous mystery. The nation was amused with the most earnest assurances that no *coup d'état* was intended, no violation of the Charter, nothing like that, which was already fully decided upon and arranged in all its

details; and these assurances were even extended to the foreign ambassadors, who looked with natural anxiety on the threatening aspect of affairs. Nay, if rumor may be credited, Baron Rothschild, who, by his connexion with the public stocks, had a more direct interest in the question than any person except the Ministers and the royal family, was tranquillized by M. de Polignac with like deceptive declarations. Letters of convocation had been despatched to the Peers and Deputies summoning them to meet the 3d of August. In short, a system of elaborate jesuitical duplicity was adopted by these royal and noble felons, to conceal the conspiracy until the appointed time arrived for exploding their 'infernal machine.' Fortunately they cheated and deluded themselves even more than they did the nation, and thus became the pitiable object of their own folly and wickedness.

In reflecting upon the events of this period, it seems difficult to understand how any Ministers could have been so ignorant of the state of public sentiment in France. The subdivisons of the nation were by no means of the same kind with those of the Chambers. Opinions, to be sure, were in some sense represented by the legislative body; that is, individuals could be found there of each of the great classes of opinion, which divided the nation. But the legislative representation was far from exact as a picture of the relative force of each party, and gave no sufficient indications of the existence or vigor of the two, which together comprised a majority of the people.

First there were the Ultras, the *Emigrés*, the Jesuits, the Church and King party, the *divine right* faction: for faction it well deserved to be called, as well in regard of its violence as the comparative smallness of its numbers. If they were few in numbers, they were desperate and uncal-

culating in policy, reckless of consequences, and deaf to all argument or counsel. They had built up their project of absolutism with painful industry, and they clung to it with inexpressible obstinacy.

> You might as well
> Forbid the sea for to obey the moon,
> As or by oath, remove, or counsel shake
> The fabric of their folly.

They blindly pursued their infatuated course on the very brink of the precipice, over which their party could not fail to be dashed to atoms. They do not deserve to be ranked with the genuine Royalists, the sensible, clear-headed, patriotic friends of monarchy, who sought in vain to preserve the integrity of the whole public system. These last were decidedly attached to the Bourbons as a dynasty, but not less hostile to the Ultras, who were obviously rushing headlong upon destruction, and hurrying the King, the Charter, and themselves into one common ruin.

There was a name, a form, a memory, which, in the latter part of the reign of Charles, dwelt upon every lip, rose before every eye, held a hallowed spot in every bosom, and yet was proscribed by the government with impotent fury in all forms of petty persecution. That name belonged to a usurper, — to a tyrant, if you will, in the modern as well as the classical interpretation of the word, — and yet his form was multiplied in every work of art and taste, and his memory identified with the glories and splendors of the Revolution. Bonaparte himself was no more; the 'Man' had perished on a desert rock in the midst of the ocean; but the 'Son of the Man' survived; and an ague fit seemed to seize on every fibre of a Bourbon at the very thought. While the inane countenance of Charles Tenth and the common-

place actions of the family were woven by authority in the brilliant threads of the Gobelin looms, or fatigued the pencil of Gérard and Gros; while Genius, yielding to the voice of Power, was vainly striving to immortalize the looks of men, who possessed an irresistible innate alacrity for sinking into oblivion; while the poor King was laboriously seeking for the honors of Art by the liberal use of the privy purse,—the inspired and inspiring features of Napoleon, and the achievements of his dazzling career, were independent of the sickly protection of government patronage, and lived in the unbought guardianship of the nation. The press groaned with histories, memoirs, anecdotes, disquisitions, concerning him and his life; and yet the supply seemed to fall far short of the insatiable demand. Sir Walter Scott's eulogy on his character was denounced as a libel, — so inadequate did its praises appear to the craving admiration of the reading world in France. While the government had no power to check the activity of the press in thus affording exciting food to the popular enthusiasm, it was rendering itself ridiculous and exposing its imbecility by sending police officers to the distilleries of *eau-de-cologne* with orders to break the bottles moulded in Napoleon's form, and persecuting the paper stainers who adorned the hangings with such disagreeable reminiscences as the bridge of Lodi, the Simplon, or the Pyramids. In short, it needed but a careless eye to see that for once the government had made a correct observation of a fact. Bonaparte's was the *popular* name, the concentration of everything, which charmed the populace of France.

It would be wrong to say that young Napoleon had a visible party; he had not; but the name was a magical word, a potent talisman among the lower classes, a portion of the soldiery, the dis-

banded veterans, some men distinguished in civil affairs, and not a few of the higher military, who had grown familiar with victory under guidance of the imperial eagles. But numerous as the Bonapartists undoubtedly were, still as a body they could not be considered the most intelligent members of the community. Men of liberal views in matters of government knew that his policy was that of concentration, and of course adverse to freedom. It was among the Republicans that the active wisdom, talent, and energy of the nation were found. Here were the men of 1789, true to their first love; the relics of the exalted spirits of 1793, untamed by adversity, clinging in old age to the flattering visions of their youth. Above all, here were the educated and enlightened men of the present generation, the mind of young France, animated by the example of the United States, looking to this country as the pattern of all that is perfect in the theory of government, all that is useful in its practical application. They constituted a party, — a powerful, numerous, indefatigable party, — ardently attached to republican forms, but willing to dispense with the forms if they could make sure of the substance; temperate and prudent in their plans as they were patriotic in their feelings; and they were gradually working the regeneration of France by preparing her to be fit for the blessings of liberty. Indeed, why should we speak of them as a party? They were the PEOPLE, constituting the great staple elements, the substantial national interests of France.

In such a condition of parties, what were the indications, which encouraged the Ministers to invade the Charter. No man knows, and they cannot tell, where they discovered any grounds of confidence whereon to proceed. A free press had been sounding the tocsin of alarm for eleven

months. The aristocracy had no power as such; for none could it have after the abolition of the rights of primogeniture. The clergy were divided, unpopular, and without influence. A violent excitation of sentiment pervaded the whole country. The election had proved the force of popular right, even in spite of the artificially devised system of electoral colleges. All men felt ready to act upon the maxims and motto of a patriotic society, which assumed for its title '*Aide toi, le Ciel t'aidera.*' The People were conscious of their rights, confident in their power to sustain them, and ready to do all and dare all, rather than submit to any arbitrary acts on the part of the King.

It has frequently been observed that the situation and character of Charles X of France were strikingly similar to those of James II of England. M. de Polignac might have taken warning from this instructive page in the history of princes, when he saw the readiness of the people to run out the extraordinary parallel to its consummation. In England Charles I, by singular alternations of weakness and obstinacy, contributed to bring on the revolution which led him to the scaffold; and in France Louis XVI, wonderfully like Charles in his virtues and his failings, had reached the same result by the same means. In France, as in England, wild utopian schemes of government, sanctioned by various factions, afterwards agitated a country given up to the usurpation and tyranny of legislative assemblies. The dictatorship of Cromwell followed in England, as that of Napoleon did in France, the military glory and personal talents of these extraordinary men having proved too powerful for the public liberties, while no legitimate monarch ever reigned with greater dignity than they, or with a truer perception of what the internal welfare of the country required.

The Restoration came next; and it needs only the same full devolopement of the history of Louis XVIII, to show how much the one voluptuary resembled the other in his character and the policy of his government. To each a brother had succeeded; and who could deny that Charles X was the very *double* of James II? The same weak unreasoning obstinacy impelled each to attempt the overturn of the constitution, which he was sworn to maintain. Charles X was not yet dethroned, for the climax of his arbitrary attempts was to come. But everybody was following out the analogy. It was unfolded in the newspapers, discussed in conversation, present to every mind. All the world seemed to say to the King: If you undertake the same enterprise, you must expect the same fate; for your kinsman of Orleans stands ready to play the identical part here, which William of Nassau enacted in England.

It was in such a state of parties, in a crisis like this, when the whole nation was expecting occasion for oppugnation and preparing to display it, that Charles undertook to assume the swelling port of absolute power. To the only faithful counsellors of his family, he seems to have held the doctrines of Leontes, forgetting that this was the age of revolutions, constitutions, and equal rights, and not that of the *jus divinum:*

> Why need we
> Commune with you of this? Nor rather follow
> Our forceful instigation! Our PREROGATIVE
> Calls not your counsel; but our natural goodness
> Imparts this; — which, if you, or stupefied,
> Or seeming so in skill, cannot or will not
> Relish as truth, like us, — inform yourselves
> We need no more of your advice; — the matter,
> The loss, the gain, the ord'ring on't, is all
> Properly ours.

No reasoning, in fact, could turn back a man,

who had acquired the obstinacy of anility without its maturity of wisdom or discretion of character. A brilliant levée was holden at St. Cloud on Sunday, the 25th of July, at which the members of the Cabinet, the *corps diplomatique*, and the *habitués* of the royal saloon, assembled for the last time to grace the Court of Charles Tenth. Those who were in the secret of the meditated *coup d'état* carefully disguised their feelings under a cheerful exterior; and the great body of courtiers felt easy amid the assurances, direct and indirect, which were holden out to them by the parties to the conspiracy. The famous Ordinances were signed on the same day, after the close of the levée, and carried to Paris by one of the Ministers to be inserted in the next Moniteur. The Keeper of the Seals himself, M. Chantelauze, who, as appears from the Trial of the Ex-Ministers, had drawn up the Report already spoken of, sent for M. Sauvo, the conductor of the Moniteur, to receive the Ordinances for publication. M. Sauvo found M. de Montbel with M. Chantelauze, the two Ministers both exhibiting the greatest dejection in their manner; and he did not disguise from them his own consternation, when he came to understand the nature of the Ordinances.

Of these Ordinances, one suspended the liberty of the press, another annulled the election of the Deputies, and a third arbitrarily changed the constitution of the future Chambers. The Ordinance relative to the press consisted of nine articles, which placed all the journals, of whatever kind, under the strict *surveillance* of the Police, so that no periodical writing should appear without authorization, to be renewed every three months, and liable at any time to be revoked or suspended. Had these provisions been constitutional in form, they would have been oppressive to the last de-

gree; but as the Charter assigns the regulation of the press to *the laws*, that is, the concurrent acts of the King and the two Chambers, this Ordinance was a palpable violation of the Charter.

The second Ordinance is brief and pithy. After setting forth as a preamble the 'Being informed of the manœuvres, which have been practised in various parts of the Kingdom, to deceive and mislead the electors during the late operations of the Electoral Colleges,' it merely ordains that '*The Chamber of Deputies of Departments is dissolved.*' Such are the words used, but they are altogether false and deceptive. No Chamber of Deputies then existed. Individuals had been elected to be members of a future Chamber hereafter to be organized; but as yet there was no Chamber. The words of the Ordinance, to speak the exact truth, should have been: 'The late elections of Deputies of Departments are annulled;' — for this and this only was what the Ordinance did, under the jesuitical pretence of exercising a constitutional power to dissolve the Chambers.

To comprehend the remaining Ordinance it is necessary to call to mind the actual and past state of the laws for the choice of Deputies. The Charter provides that, 'The Chamber of Deputies shall be composed of Deputies elected by the Electoral Colleges, the organization of which shall be determined by the laws' (art. 30;) and that 'Each Department shall have the same number of Deputies that it had *until the present time*' (art. 31.) Previous to the law of June, 1820, the number of Deputies had been 258, all returned by Electoral Colleges, of which there was but one for each Department, and consisting of the whole body of qualified electors, voting altogether, or in sections, according to circumstances (Loi 5 Février, 1817.) After a few years' trial

of this system, it appeared to operate too favorably for the democratic principle, and the Ministers devised the ingenious legerdemain of the *double vote*, heretofore mentioned, to augment the power of the aristocracy (Loi 29 Juin, 1820.) The Electoral Colleges already subsisting were suffered to remain in substance, with the right of returning the 258 old members as before, only divided into permanent sections, called Colleges of Arrondissements. At the same time 172 new members were added, to be chosen by bodies called Departmental Colleges, composed, says the law, 'of the electors paying the highest tax, in number equal to the fourth part of all the electors in the Department' (art. 2.) These 172 Deputies, be it observed, were created by a ministerial manœuvre for the sole purpose of giving the nomination of two fifths of all the members to a select body of the aristocracy, in the hope that a small portion, at least, of the other three-fifths would continue favorable to the court-party, so as thus permanently to secure a majority to the Ministers. Of course, this addition to the Chamber, and this mode of electing the additional members, had always been vehemently censured by the liberal party, whose influence was thus greatly abridged. One thing more is to be remarked, namely, that the members of the elective Chamber are, in the language of the Charter, styled 'Deputies of Departments' (art 50.) This expression would seem to be the true legal denomination for *all* the Deputies collectively; and it is thus applied even in the Ordinance of July 25th, for dissolving the Chamber.

These explanations have been premised in order that the reader may fully understand the mingled meanness, effrontery, and tyranny of the Ordinance relative to the elections. It begins by

providing that, 'Conformably to the articles 15, 36, and 50 of the Constitutional Charter the Chamber of Deputies shall consist only of Deputies of Departments' (art. 1;) and that 'Each Department shall have the number of Deputies allotted to it by the 36th article of the Constitutional Charter' (art. 3.) Such are the very terms of the Ordinance; and when we come to render these cabalistical phrases into something more intelligible to us vulgar sublunary mortals, it will be seen that M. de Peyronnet, the author of this Ordinance, had practised very diligently upon the maxim of the honest diplomatist, who defined words to be 'instruments employed for concealing one's meaning.' The signification of the latter article is, 'Henceforth the Chamber of Deputies shall contain but 258 members;' thus repealing the law of June, 1820. The signification of the other article is equally abstruse and recondite, and is veiled in a most contemptible quibble. If the sentence had been worded in the simplicity and directness of an honest purpose, it would have been, 'Henceforth the Deputies shall be chosen by the Departmental Colleges alone.' The singular phraseology actually employed was adopted in a spirit of low cunning, in order to have it seem that the Ordinance was but a restoration of the Charter. So far as it regarded the number of Deputies contemplated by the Ordinance it was indeed a return to the Charter; but if the 172 new members elected under the law of 1820 were all unconstitutional, by whom were they introduced and for what purpose? Were they not the creation of the government? Was not their creation a mere trick, a device, a far-fetched expedient, to enable the government to return members favorable to themselves, out of the ranks and by the votes of the high aristocracy alone? But what

right had M. de Peyronnet to assert, as he impliedly did, that the Deputies chosen by the Colleges of Arrondissements, that is, by the whole body of electors, were not Deputies of Departments within the true intent of the Charter? He undertakes virtually to affirm that none, but Deputies chosen by the newly invented Colleges of June, 1820, are Deputies in any sense, and by force of this notable discovery disfranchises at once all those electors, who under the law of 1817 voted either in the mass or in sections, and under the law of 1820 were permanently organized into sections. The whole electoral power was thus thrown into the hands of the famous 'fourth part,' — les électeurs les plus imposés, — nothing being assigned to the other three-fourths but the right of nominating a list of candidates, out of whom the 'fourth part' should choose half the Deputies.

The Ordinance, of course, never took effect, and therefore is only important in a historical point of view. It was illegal in the same way the others were, inasmuch as it did that by royal decree, which, according to the Charter, could only be done by enacted laws. It operated in fact a total change of the whole constitution of the Chambers. We have taken pains to give a just account of the mode in which it was devised, because this does not appear to have been well understood out of France, and could not be, indeed, without careful examination of the pre-existing laws on the subject. It should be added that another Ordinance convoked the Electoral Colleges according to the new system, and appointed a meeting of the new Chambers that were to be thus unconstitutionally elected, for the 28th of September.

When these Ordinances appeared in the Moniteur, and began to be generally known, as they were read in the gardens, *cafés*, and *cabinets de*

lecture, nothing could exceed the consternation they universally occasioned. People in general had, perhaps, been lulled into comparative tranquillity, supposing that the great struggle would not take place until after the regular meeting of the Chambers. They supposed it would be so, because they presumed the King would act with some degree of discretion, and they saw the manifest advantage to him in having the crisis deferred until the Chambers should take some step of a violent or unreasonable character, so as to give a color of necessity to his arbitrary designs, and thus make sure of the sympathies of Europe. They supposed it would be so, because they saw no token of preparation, on the part of the Ministers, to encounter a popular movement. And they were astounded at the profligate audacity of the Ministers, in thus rooting up all the dearest bulwarks of the Charter at once, and in a manner as insulting to the sense of the nation, as it was destructive of their liberties. But indignation, a determination to make a stand for their rights, desire of organization, and a looking around for the means of resisting the government, soon took the place, in the minds of all men, of the stupor and amazement of the first impression. The leading spirits saw that it was a crisis for boldness not for caution; for action, not for deliberation. The *casus belli* had arrived. If a single encroachment on the Charter had come at a time, the Liberals might have doubted and reasoned and calculated, and waited for the next blow, before making a demonstration themselves; but here was a sheet of the Moniteur abolishing the Charter as it were in a paragraph,—here were the guarantees of the public liberty dashed out at once by a single bold sweep of the ministerial sponge:—and the emergency left no alternative to the nation but slavery

or civil war. They could not hesitate which to choose.

Paris contains an extraordinary proportion of intelligent residents, who, by education, taste, or principle, have always been the zealous friends of the popular cause. Vast numbers of schools and colleges, frequented by ardent young men thrown loose from the restraints of domesticity, have at all times furnished busy agents in the political movements of this remarkable city. A spirit of liberty was a distinguishing trait of the great scholars and writers, who gave celebrity to the literary departments of the higher seminaries of education. Cultivators of the fine arts, men of letters by profession, from the humbler writers for the daily press or the stage, up to the great names of the Institute, a host of men connected with the professions of medicine and law, — in short, most of those, who depended upon the culture of their understandings for subsistence or for fame, were, as a matter of course, opposed to the policy of the government. It would be instructive to inquire why it is that, in France, the intellectual classes are so generally found on the side of public rights. An American would feel no hesitation in saying that it was the homage of reason to the cause of liberty; a French Ultra would be driven at least to admit that the Bourbons must have played the game of despotism badly, to have driven from them all the enthusiastic hearts, all the brilliant geniuses, all the cultivated minds of a nation, which had nearly worshipped the iron sceptre of Napoleon. But remarkable as it is, that a vast majority of the classes thus described should have been found ripe for revolution, it is more so that the great proprietors, the extensive manufacturers, the wealthy capitalists, should have embraced the same cause, with a certainty of encountering great hazards in

a pecuniary point of view, and the probability of sustaining immense losses. Such, however, was undoubtedly the fact; and when to the individuals already designated, we add the *commis*, the disbanded soldiers of other days, and so forth, men who are generally better informed than the ordinary *bourgeois* of a European city, we shall find, at this emergency, a most imposing aggregate of intelligence on the side of the popular interest, without reckoning those veteran politicians by profession, who, in the Chambers or elsewhere, fixed the attention of all France.

The publication of the Ordinances was the signal to the trusted men of the liberal party to confer on the measures, which it behoved them to adopt in self defence. Fortunately they possessed means of organization, which, if less perfect than the catenation of *bureaux* by which the government were accustomed to act, were yet sufficiently complete for all the purposes of the occasion. Many of the Deputies were already in Paris, either because they resided there, or as having arrived in anticipation of the coming session. Couriers were despatched into the country to General La Fayette, M. Lafitte, and other influential men, who were near enough to be accessible. It is said that patriotic societies facilitated the adoption of concerted measures, some of these societies being public, such as the association called 'Aide toi, le Ciel t'aidera,' formed to aid the liberal party in the late elections; — others of a secret nature, which had been aiming at higher objects, and had veiled their very existence in mystery to avoid the visitation of the laws. It does not appear how far the events of the Three Days may have been planned and settled beforehand by the leading Liberals; but there is every reason to believe that resistance was de-

liberately decided upon, and all feasible means adopted to make that resistance effectual. If the Liberals actually possessed the *Comité Directeur*, which afflicted the wiseacres of the *Quotidienne* so much, now certainly was the time, and here the proper sphere, for calling all its energies into action. We shall see hereafter that the leading members of the party did not shrink from any responsibility, which armed resistance to the government might involve.

On Monday, however, little occurred to open the eyes of the Ministers, to the fatal step they had taken. The government neither saw nor anticipated the civil war, that was to burst upon them the next day. Disturbances, groups of obstreperous students, possibly a *fusillade* of the mob, — they deemed this the utmost that could occur. But they strangely miscalculated the character of the hour. Unfortunately for the government, the enterprise and capital of the country, as we have just remarked, ranked with the liberal party. So much of that enterprise and that capital, as was embarked in newspapers or printing establishments of any kind, felt the illegal acts of the government directly. The Ordinance relative to the press was important, as an invasion of the right of publishing opinions given by the Charter; but it was also important, as destructive to a large and profitable branch of industry, which gave employment, it is computed, to not less than thirty thousand of the inhabitants of Paris. The printers, and other workmen connected with the journals, were at once stripped of employment by Ordinance, and let loose upon society ready for any desperate act. 'My friends,' said one of the great publishers, '*the Press is abolished today;* I cannot give you work any longer; *go ask it from your good King.*' But the situation of the printers, thus

sent abroad upon a terrible mission of insurrection, exhibited only a small part of the evil. Either from a just apprehension of the effect of the Ordinances, or on purpose to foment disorder, discounts at the Bank were stopped, and the great manufacturers dismissed their workmen and shut up their establishments, probably giving to their workmen the same consolatory advice, which the printers had received. Now when we consider that Paris and its faubourgs contains a numerous manufacturing population, we shall estimate the revolutionary force, which a sudden unforeseen cessation of all work, occasioned by an illegal act of the government, must place in the hands of agitators; and by such men we shall see it was, that the battle of the Three Days was fought. But the unarmed mobs, which alone appeared in Paris on Monday, although they committed outrages upon the Hotel of Foreign Affairs on the Boulevards, where M. de Polignac resided, and upon the Hotel of the Minister of Finance, occasioned so little anxiety, that the King and the Dauphin went to Rambouillet to hunt the next day, as if nothing peculiar had transpired. Whether fatuity or infatuation be the proper characteristic of the conduct of Charles, let posterity judge; we must have recourse to one or the other of those qualities to account for his wonderful ignorance of his own position. It is well observed by a sensible English writer, that 'the Egyptian hermit, standing on his solitary pillar in the desert, was not more isolated from the knowledge and sympathies of his countrymen, than Charles X on his divine-right throne was from all acquaintance with the state of France.'

Meanwhile the editors of public journals,—on whom the hand of despotism had fallen more immediately,—whose property was absolutely anni-

hilated by an arbitrary decree of the government, — performed an act of independence and patriotism, called for to be sure by the circumstances of the case, but still every way honorable to the parties. A portion of them having conferred together, agreed upon a joint Protest against the unconstitutional Ordinances. This remarkable paper, which is dated July 26th, and originally made its appearance in the *National*, is not only interesting in respect of its effect at the time, but also as presenting a condensed view of the legal objections to the Ordinances. It is in the following words:

'It has been repeatedly announced within the last six months, that the laws would be violated, that a *coup d'etat* would be struck. The good sense of the public refused to believe it. Ministers repelled the supposition as a calumny. Nevertheless, the Moniteur has at last published those memorable Ordinances, which are the most daring violation of the laws. Legal government is therefore interrupted, and that of force has commenced.

'In the situation wherein we are placed, obedience ceases to be a duty The citizens, who are first called upon to obey, are Editors of Journals: it devolves on them to give the first example of resistance to authority, which has divested itself of a legal character. The reasons, on which they rely, are such, that simply to state them suffices.

'The matters, to which the Ordinances promulgated this morning relate, are among those whereon the royal authority has no power, according to the Charter, to decide alone. The Charter declares, (art. 8) that the French, in affairs of the Press, shall conform themselves *to the laws*; it does not say to ordinances. The Charter says (Art. 35) that the organization of the Electoral Colleges shall be regulated by laws; it does not say by ordinances.

'Hitherto the Crown itself has recognised these articles: It has never thought of arming itself against them, either with a pretended constituent power, or with the power falsely attributed to Art. 14.

'In fact, at all times, when circumstances of an alleged serious nature have seemed to the Crown to demand modifications, either in the administration of the Press, or in the electoral system, it has had recourse to the two Chambers.

When it was deemed requisite to modify the Charter, in order to establish the septennial election and integral renewal of Deputies, the Crown had recourse not to itself as the author of the Charter, but to the Chambers.

'Royalty, therefore, has of itself recognised and acted upon these articles 8 and 35, and has not arrogated, with respect to these, either a constituent authority, or a dictatorial authority which nowhere exists.

'The tribunals, which have a right of interpretation, have solemnly acknowledged the same principles. The Cour Royale of Paris condemned the publishers of the Breton Subscription as authors of an outrage on the Government. It considered the supposition, that Government would employ the authority of ordinances where the authority of law only is admissible, as an outrage.

'Thus the formal texts of the Charter, the practice hitherto followed by the Crown, and the decisions of the tribunals, all establish, that in things affecting the Press and the electoral organization, the laws alone, — that is to say, the King and Chambers, — can have power to determine.

'Today, then, the Government has violated legality. We are dispensed from yielding it obedience. We shall endeavor to publish our papers without asking the authorization required of us. We shall use all possible exertions that today at least, they shall be delivered to all France. This is what our duty as citizens requires, and we shall fulfil it.

'It is not for us to point out to the Chamber, illegally dissolved, the duties which it has to perform. But we may be permitted to supplicate the Deputies in the name of France, to rest on their evident right, and to resist with all their power the violation of the laws. Their right is as clear as that whereon we stand. The Charter declares (Art. 50) that the King may dissolve the Chamber of Deputies; but that he may do this it is necessary the Chambers should have been assembled, and constituted a Chamber, and indeed that it should have pursued a line of conduct calling for its dissolution. But until it assembles, until it is constituted a Chamber, there is nothing but elections, nothing but returns of members elect. Now the Charter nowhere says that the King has power to annul the elections; and the Ordinances published are therefore illegal, because they undertake to do what the Charter does not authorize.

'The Deputies elected, and convoked on the third of August, are therefore well and truly elected and convoked. Their right today is the same as it was yesterday. France implores them to remember it. Whatever they can do to maintain this right, it is their duty to do.

'The Government has this day lost the character of legality which commands obedience. We resist it in what concerns us. It remains with France to judge how far her resistance shall extend.' *

It is questionable whether the pages of history contain a more noble and spirited act of temperate reclamation against the measures of arbitrary power than this. For it is to be remembered, that it is not the declaration of delegated agents in behalf of the rights of a community represented by them: nor the manifesto of a convention, or congress, or any other organized body of men. It is a dignified exposition, made by private individuals, of the illegality of the administrative proceedings, by which they are personally aggrieved; and in thus much is entitled to signal praise. But it is also a courageous exposition of the illegality of the government itself; and in this respect demands the gratitude of all France, and the admiration of the friends of liberty throughout the world. These high-minded journalists had boldly lifted up the

*The names of the courageous and patriotic citizens, who thus placed themselves in the front of resistance to arbitrary power, belong to history. The declaration is signed by

MM. Gauja, conductor of the *National*.
Thiers, Mignet, Carrel, Chambolle, Peysse, Albert Stapfer, Dubochet, Rolle, editors of the *National*.
Leroux, conductor of the *Globe*.
De Guizard, editor of the *Globe*.
Sarrans jun. conductor of the *Courrier des Electeurs*.
B. Dejean, editor of the *Globe*.
Guyet, Moussette, editors of the *Globe*.
Auguste Fabre, chief editor of the *Tribune des Départemens*.
Année, editor of the *Constitutionnel*.
Cauchois-Lemaire, editor of the *Constitutionnel*.
Senty, of the *Temps*.
Haussman, of the *Temps*.
Avenel, of the *Courrier Français*.
Dussard, of the *Temps*.
Levasseur, editor of the *Révolution*.

veil of illusion, which habitual deference, and the actual possession of power, threw around the position of the King. Confident in the justice of their cause, they had the moral greatness to proclaim to the people, in the language of one of their number, that the body politic was dissolved by the voluntary act of the King, and that, by his attack on the Charter, France was replaced in the provisional situation, from which it had been raised in 1814, by the adoption of the fundamental law of the State. The declaration of the editors, being widely circulated and universally read, gave a character of legalized violence to the movements of the Parisian populace. It called upon them not to violate but to uphold the laws; not to levy war against the government, but to take up arms in defence of the constitutional government, against the traitorous acts of those, by whom it was administered for the time being. Whether those individuals were kings or ministers, it mattered not; for the time had arrived when the divine right

MM. Evariste Dumoulin, of the *Constitutionnel.*
Alexis de Jussieu, editor of the *Courrier Français.*
Chatelain, conductor of the *Courrier Français.*
Plagnol, chief editor of the *Révolution.*
Fazy, editor of the *Révolution.*
Buzoni, Barbaroux, editors of the *Temps.*
Chalas, editor of the *Temps.*
A. Billiard, editor of the *Temps.*
Ader, of the *Tribune des Départemens.*
F. Larreguy, editor of the *Journal du Commerce.*
J. F. Dupont, advocate, editor of the *Courrier Français.*
Ch. de Rémusat, of the *Globe.*
V. de Lapelouze, conductor of the *Courrier Français.*
Bohain and Roqueplan, of the *Figaro.*
Coste, conductor of the *Temps.*
J. J. Baude, editor of the *Temps.*
Bert, conductor of the *Journal du Commerce.*
Léon Pillet, conductor of the *Journal de Paris*
Valliant, conductor of the *Sylphe.*

of the people was recognised as paramount to the divine right of princes, the former being coeval and coextensive with creation and created men, the latter being secondary to, and dependent upon, the first, — less entitled to the *prestige* of antique venerableness, less fortified by reliance on the wide spread foundations of universal application. Frenchmen had long since ceased to be royal vassals; they had exchanged that condition for the higher one of citizens governed by a Constitutional Charter. While they admitted that the Executive was authorized to compel *their* obedience to the laws of the land, they at the same time maintained that they had a right to compel *his* obedience to the laws of the land. And the declaration of the editors called upon the nation to uphold the Charter and the laws, by justifiable resistance to the usurpation of the Head of the State.

It will have been seen that the editors deny that the crown possessed any constituent authority, or any general authority by the Charter, to sanction the Ordinances. They alludo, in these passages, to the Report of the Ministers, accompanying the Ordinances. This document is an elaborate attempt to justify the Ordinances, by general reasonings on the tenor of the Charter. It concludes in the following words:

'The right, as well as the duty, of assuring the maintenance of itself, is the inseparable attribute of sovereignty. No government on earth could remain standing, if it had not the right to provide for its own security. This power exists before the laws because it is in the nature of things. These are maxims which have in their favor the sanction of time, and the assent of all the publicists of Europe.

'But these maxims have another sanction still more positive, that of the Charter itself. The 14th article has invested your majesty with a sufficient power, not undoubtedly to change our institutions, but to consolidate them and render them more stable.

'Circumstances of imperious necessity do not permit the

exercise of this supreme power to be any longer deferred. The moment is come to have recourse to measures, which are in the spirit of the Charter, but which are beyond the limits of legal order, the resources of which have been exhausted in vain.'

These extracts set forth two grounds, then, as justifying the Ordinances, namely, the text of the Charter and certain other considerations. The article referred to is in these words: 'The King is the supreme chief of the State, he commands the forces by sea and land, declares war, concludes treaties of peace, alliance, and commerce, names to all employments of public admininistration, and makes *the regulations and ordinances necessary for the execution of the laws and the safety of the State.*' In addition to the remarks made in the Declaration of the editors, concerning the extraordinary power just discovered by the Ministers in the mystical words of this article, it may be observed, that the meaning they give it, is not only contrary to the established construction practically received by the crown, and formally pronounced by the tribunals, but is so extravagant in itself, and so inconsistent with the whole spirit and many express clauses of the Charter, that one can hardly believe the Ministers were sincere in appealing to it for sanction. It was a mockery of common sense to do so. In fact, the Ministers themselves admit that the article gives no right 'to change the institutions' of the country, but only 'to consolidate them and render them more stable.' But while the distinction asserted in this admission is altogether imaginary, the very terms of the admission go upon a false assumption of the facts. For who can be so regardless of truth as to pretend that, for the King to undertake the entire reorganization of the Chamber of Deputies, a co-ordinate branch of the govern-

ment, is no 'change of the institutions' of France?

If, anterior to the Three Days, the Chamber of Deputies had assumed to alter the line of succession, or had even undertaken to negotiate a treaty of alliance with some insurgent nation struggling for constitutional privileges, the Chamber would hardly have escaped with the excuse, that this did not constitute a 'change of the institutions' of the country, but only a consolidation of them, and a rendering of them 'more stable.' But royal interpreters of constitutions, and royal expounders of the grounds of royal authority, have an incorrigible antipathy to the golden maxim of doing as they would be done by, and to suffering others to claim the benefit of the general rules of construction, which they apply to their own case. And if anything can be certain in the interpretation of the Constitutional Charter, it is that the royal authority in making ordinances shall keep in view the execution of the laws and the safety of the State, as coincident and inseparably associated objects. To suppose that the King, upon his own estimate of the exigency, can repeal or change the laws of the land, nay, act in defiance of the Charter, is to make him at once an absolute instead of a constitutional monarch. If there was any clause in the Charter, which so placed the King above the Charter and the laws, that he might change both whenever he thought the safety of the people required it, the Charter itself would be a nullity; for of what use could it be, except as a fixed limitation of the powers and rights of the component elements of the State, including as well the King as the rest of the nation, nay before all and above all including the King?

In the newspapers and other publications of the ministerial party, much had been said, previous to the publication of the Ordinances, of the

nature of the principle on which the Charter is founded. Men had not forgotten that, when the imperial-throne was declared vacant by the Conservative Senate, it was offered to Louis XVI upon conditions, namely, on his accepting the Constitutional Charter, which they proposed as the basis of the new order of things. By a series of tricks, — which in private individuals would be considered highly dishonorable, but which hereditary kings it would seem are privileged by blood and birth to practise, — and by the countenance of the Cossacs and sundry other congenial apostles of liberty encamped in sight of the Tuileries, — Louis was enabled to evade compliance with the conditions of his restoration to the throne of his ancestors. He found it necessary, however, to do something; and it is fair to admit that he did much for France, in the Charter of June 4th, 1814. But in the preamble to the instrument he takes care to make the most offensive reservations concerning his personal authority, the source of his power, and its actual extent. It is 'Louis, *by the grace of God* King of France and Navarre,' that speaks. It is 'Divine Providence' that has recalled him to his States; that is, Divine Providence acting directly and for his personal benefit, not through the intervention of the national will, nor for the good of the nation.

Accordingly, after suitable reflections upon the liberal spirit of the Louises, the Philips, and the Henrys, who had gone before him, and his own disposition to consult the temper of the times; and finding a precedent for free institutions in the assemblies of the Champs-de-Mars and de-Mai, he proceeds: 'For these causes, we have voluntarily and in the free exercise of our royal authority granted, as we do hereby grant, make concession and *octroi* to our subjects, as well for us as for our

successors, and forever, of the Constitutional Charter which follows.' Now many of the short-sighted subjects of absolutism were found stupid enough to contend that, as the Charter was a voluntary grant, concession, or *octroi* of royal authority, the same royal authority might reclaim and resume the whole or any part of it. They forgot that, if it was a voluntary grant, yet it was expressly made FOREVER; that his most Christian Majesty had solemnly sworn to maintain it inviolate; and that if the crown saw fit to resume this grant thus made forever and sanctioned by oath, the nation were of course reinstated in the political condition of March, 1814, when they were a free people with a crown to bestow,—with this material difference, that then the deliberations of the people were overawed by the invading host of the victorious Allies, and that now France would be herself again, free in her resolves, mighty in her purposes, and answerable only to the all-just God of nations for her sovereign and irremovable decision.

In truth, the Ministers, conscious of the weakness and untenableness of any ground of justification for the Ordinances within the Charter, very frankly appealed for sanction to a certain transcendental power existing 'before the laws;' and professedly stepping 'beyond the limits of legal order,' called in aid 'the supreme power' of sovereignty, growing out of the 'nature of things.' This was certainly frank and fair, whatever might be deemed of its policy, wisdom, or justice. The Ministers openly soared above the lower regions, the humble terra firma of the Charter, into the clouds and darkness of the 'nature of things.' They avowedly took for their authority in issuing the Ordinances, not the powers and rights held by the crown under the Charter, but the power

and right of usurpation for the purpose of making his authority more stable. But in doing this, they should have remembered that the power and right of revolution on the part of the people correspond to the power and right of usurpation on the part of the crown. In abandoning the Charter, therefore, the Ministers converted Charles into a king *de facto* instead of a king *de jure;* and ceasing to be king *de jure*, he could expect to be king *de facto*, only by hazarding the venture of a civil war, and submitting the hereditary rights of the Bourbons to the arbitrament of the sword. In voluntarily breaking his oath of fidelity to the Charter, he absolved his subjects from their correlative oath of allegiance, and each party to the social compact, the King and the Nation, now stood upon their respective natural rights, or upon what the philosophical M. de Chantelauze denominate power derived from 'the nature of things,' which we may take to signify nothing more nor less, when translated from the Olympian dialect of these *dii minores*, than *physical force*. The people were therefore justified in saying that the government had ceased to possess the character of legality, which commands obedience, and that in fact the body politic was dissolved, to be reconstructed, after its elements had once more passed through the fiery trial of civil war. Thus it was impossible to mistake the true nature of the crisis, that was pending over the destinies of France.

By their Protest against the Ordinances, and the publication of it, the editors of the daily journals rendered themselves individually responsible for the declarations contained in the paper to which they affixed their names. It was a noble example; and it was soon followed by the Deputies, who, with the journalists, were the individuals immediately affected by the Ordinances. The

Protest of the Deputies did not make its appearance on the same day, but may be introduced here with propriety, as belonging to the same part of our subject. It is in the following words:

'The undersigned, duly elected Deputies, in conformity with the Constitutional Charter, and the laws concerning elections, and being actually at Paris,

'Consider themselves imperatively called upon, by their duty and their honor, to protest against the measures, which the advisers of the Crown have lately taken, for the overthrow of the legal system of elections, and the destruction of the liberty of the Press.

'These measures, as contained in the Ordinances of July 25th, are, in the opinion of the undersigned, directly contrary to the constitutional rights of the Chambers, to the public rights of the French, and to the attributes and decrees of the tribunals, and calculated to throw the State into confusion, equally endangering its present peace and its future security.

'Wherefore the undersigned, inviolably faithful to their oaths, unitedly protest, not only against the said measures, but against all acts which may be consequent thereon.

'And considering, on the one hand, that the Chamber of Deputies, not having been constituted, could not be legally dissolved, — and on the other that the attempt, to form a new Chamber of Deputies in a novel and arbitrary manner, is in formal contradiction to the Constitutional Charter and the vested rights of the electors, — the undersigned declare, that they consider themselves as legally elected members of the Chamber by the Colleges of the Arrondissements and Departments, whose suffrages they have received, and as incapable of being replaced except by virtue of elections made according to the principles and forms prescribed by law.

'And if the undersigned do not, in fact, exercise all the rights and discharge all the duties, appertaining to their legal election, it will be so only because they are prevented by actual violence.'

However much in earnest the King and his Ministers might be, the declarations of the journalists and the liberal Deputies showed that these were not less so. It only remained to see, in the appeal to force which was approaching, which of the two parties was to be convicted of treason; for it

depended on the award of victory to decide whether the King or his people should bear the shame, and incur the forfeits, of treason. *

In the course of the day the Police had not been idle, although its operations were confined within the sphere of its appropriate functions, and the troops were not called to its aid. The two objects of the gendarmerie during the day had been to check the circulation of the journals, and to prevent the concentration of citizens in the walks. An ordinance under the hand of M. Mangin, Prefect of Police, was posted on the walls in all parts of the city, prohibiting the circulation of any printed writing, which did not bear the names, and so forth, of its author and printer; and also providing that any proprietor of a reading-room, *café* or the like, who furnished his customers with papers printed contrary to the Ordinance of July 25th, should be prosecuted, and his establishment closed. The Police went further; and, under pretence of suppressing disorder-

* The Protest of Deputies bore the following names: —

MM. Labbey de Pompières	MM. Collot
Sébastiani	Gaetan de la Rochefoucauld
Méchin	Mauguin
Périer (Casimir)	Bernard
Guizot	Voisin de Gartempe
Audry de Puyraveau	Froidefond de Belleisle
Villemain	Alexandre de Laborde
Didot (Firmin)	Jacques Lefèbvre
Daunou	Mathieu Dumas
Villemot	Eusèbe Salverte
De la Biboissière	De Poulmaine
Bondy (Comte de)	Hernoux
Duris-Dufresne	Chardel
Girod de l'Ain	Bavoux
Laisné de la Villevêque	Charles Dupin
Delessert (Benjamin)	Hèly d' Hoyssel
Marchal	Eugène d' Harcourt
Nau de Champ-Louis	Baillot
Comte de Lobau	Général Lafayette

ly assemblies, caused the coffee houses and reading-rooms to be cleared of visiters, and places of refreshment and amusement to be shut up, including the theatres. Gendarmes patrolled all the streets and places of public resort, watching the movements of the citizens, and anxiously interposing to check any tendency to popular ebullition. The general symptoms of sedition and threatened disturbance, together with the strong feeling of anxiety which pervaded all classes of the community and men of all opinions, led to the closing of several shops and public buildings; and the galleries of the Palais Royal were shut at an early hour.

Baron Louis	Georges Lafayette
Millaux	Jouvencel
Estourmel (Comte d')	Bertin de Vaux
Montguyon (Comte de)	Vassal
Levaillant	Bérard
Tronchon	Duchaffaut
Gérard (Le Général)	Auguste de Saint-Aignan
Lafitte (Jacques)	Kératry
Garcias	Ternaux
Dugas-Montbel	Jacques Odier
Camille Perrier	Benjamin Constant
Comte de Lameth	

M. Sarrans gives a very singular account of the manner of signing this paper. He avers that ten Deputies only being present at M. Bérard's on the 28th, M. Guizot proposed signing the Declaration with the 'names of all the Deputies, absent as well as present, whose opinions were known to favor the liberal side.' To this M. Sébastiani objected; but his objections were met by M. Lafitte, who said: 'Let us adopt this proposition, gentlemen. Should we be vanquished they will contradict us, and prove that we are only eight: if, on the other hand, we are conquerors, rest assured the signatures will be matter of emulation.' Upon which, M. Sarrans adds, the declaration was sanctioned by sixty-three parliamentary names of presumed patriotism, out of the four hundred and thirty, who composed the Chamber of Deputies. This account, if substantially true, cannot be perfectly exact; because M. Guizot must have spoken only of the Deputies 'actually in Paris,' according to the tenor of the Declaration.

Young tradesmen paraded the streets towards evening, armed with sword-canes, which they flourished in the air with cries of '*Vive la Charte!*' and as night closed in, crowds of artisans and others made their appearance, bearing sword-canes, bludgeons, or pistols. But civil war had not yet come. These incidents were only indications of the more excited state of public feeling, which the least struggle between the citizens and the authorities would infallibly engender. The Parisian populace were now in the situation of the baited animal in the lists, who, foreseeing a desperate engagement about to arrive, lashes himself into fury by pawing the earth, tossing his head, and uttering muttered cries, the precursors of a mad encounter with his tormentors. The tumultuary troops of reckless young men, who, in a city like Paris, are not apt to be slow to embrace such occasions for the devclopement of their superabundant animal spirits, and who now thronged the streets with the watchwords of Liberty, Law, and the Charter upon their lips, needed but little added stimulus and organization to be converted into an insurrectionary civic army, ripe for deeds of courageous self-devotion. Apprehensive that the immediate circulation of the Ordinanccs, and of the comments of the journalists thereon, would have the same effect in the provinces, that it had in the capital, in waking the people to a state of almost phrenzied excitement, the Police, it is affirmed, took steps to arrest the journals at the Post Office. But the government had all along found the press to be a terrible antagonist to their designs; and their final assault upon it was the signal, as we shall presently see, for the opening of the warfare of the Three Days.

Thus ended Monday the 26th of July. During the night no event of much consequcncc trans-

pired; nor on the morning of Tuesday had a revolution yet apparently commenced. What signalized the early part of the day was the procedure of the government in regard to those refractory newspapers, which persisted in making their appearance without the authorization required by the new Ordinance. It will be conceived that the *Moniteur*, the *Quotidienne*, the *Gazette de France*, and other ministerial journals, readily put on the trammels, which they were commanded to wear. One opposition journal, the *Messager des Chambres*, followed their example. 'Strong in our consciences and our principles,' say the editors, 'we have thought that an opposition journal was still necessary, not to discuss acts which we will not characterize, and which, under present circumstances we cannot discuss, but to collect facts, to give them to the public, and to rectify them if they should be disfigured by the ministerial journals.' But the sentiments and intention of the great body of the liberal editors, as proclaimed in their Protest, would not permit them to enter into compromise with usurped authority; — and they resisted in various ways, according to the different circumstances in which they happened respectively to be placed.

The conductors of the *Journal du Commerce*, of *La France Nouvelle*, and of the *Courrier Français*, were desirous to issue their papers, but found that the master printers whom they employed, intimidated by the threats of the Police, refused to execute the printing. The *Journal du Commerce* speedily obtained a decree of the Courts in the following words:

'Considering the Ordinance of the King, of the 25th, relative to the Press, has not been promulgated according to the forms prescribed by the Ordinance of the 27th of November, 1826, and that of the 18th of January, 1817: We order M.

Selligue to proceed to the composition and printing of the *Journal du Commerce*, which is to appear tomorrow.'

A decree of the same tenor was directed to M. Plassan, printer of *La France Nouvelle*. The conductors of the *Courrier Français* addressed a circular to their subscribers, stating the controversy with their printer as the reason why their paper did not appear. — 'The dispute,' say they, 'has been referred to the tribunals. We shall employ all legal means to make our right triumph; but we shall not apply for a license, which would seem to imply our submission to acts, which violate the Charter and the laws.' Although no decision was had upon this case until the next day, it may be allowed to anticipate the strict succession of events, and to introduce here the remarkable judgment of the Tribunal of Commerce, as follows:

'Considering that, by an agreement between the parties, Gaultier Laguionie had bound himself to print for the editors of the journal entitled the *Courrier Français*, and that all agreements lawfully made should be carried into effect, it is in vain that M. Gaultier Laguionie would avoid a compliance with his engagements, on the ground of a notice from the Prefect of Police, enjoining on him obedience to the Ordinance of the 25th, which Ordinance, being contrary to the Charter, could not be obligatory, either upon the sacred and inviolable person of the King, or upon the citizens whose right it attacks: — Considering further that, according to the forms of the Charter, ordinances can only be issued for the purpose of executing and maintaining the laws, and that the above Ordinance, on the contrary, would have the effect of violating the provisions of the law of July 28th, 1828: — the Tribunal ordains and decrees that the agreement between the parties shall be carried into effect, and consequently condemns *par corps* Gaultier Laguionie to print the *Courrier Français* within twenty-four hours, and in case of his failure so to do reserves the right of the editors to sue for damages,' &c.

These decisions of the courts upon the Ordinance complete the singular picture of illegality

presented by the operations of the infatuated King. The decisions, whereof an account has been given, embrace the whole question at issue; for the ground, on which one of the Ordinances is pronounced unconstitutional, applies equally to each of the others. Here, therefore, we have the courts of justice directly and openly countenancing the citizens in their plans of acting in plain defiance of the royal authority, and thus communicating the character of full and perfect legality even to violence, if it should be committed in self-defence against any violence on the part of the crown. In fine, the tribunals had declared that a revolution would be lawful.

Reverting, then, to the morning of Tuesday, we find the *Temps*, the *Figaro*, and the *National* appearing without a license. The *National* and the *Temps*, especially, by means of well devised secret arrangements, were printed and published in spite of the vigilance of the Police. They were issued gratuitously at their respective offices, and in the same way distributed in various quarters of the city. The conductors of these two papers, who had been distinguished for their zeal and courage, professed a determination to defend themselves and their premises by force, if any violence should be offered by the agents of the government. Crowds of people thronged their doors, to whom they threw out the papers, with injunctions to every individual to take up arms in defence of his country. Young men ran through the gardens, distributing the *National* or the *Temps* to the eager multitude who formed themselves into groups, to hear read aloud the ardent appeals to their patriotism contained in those free-spirited journals. In this way, information concerning the Ordinances, and the views of the liberal party thereon, came to be much more universally cir-

culated on Tuesday than it had been the day before; for that, which had been previously known only to particular classes of persons, was now thoroughly understood by all Paris.

Out of these bold proceedings of the editors of the *National* and the *Temps*, grew the first occasion for resort to actual force. Several hours elapsed after the distribution of their papers, before the Ministers decided what steps to take. At length, about noon, commissaries of Police, with a strong force of gendarmes, mounted and on foot, attacked the office of the *National* in the Rue Saint Marc. They demanded admission, but were refused, and finally broke open the doors, seized on the types and other materials, and carried off or broke the machinery so as to render it wholly unserviceable. The same things took place at the office of the *Temps*. In addition to which it is said that, finding it difficult to break into the doors of the latter office, the commissary sent for various smiths, who refused to aid him in picking the lock; and he was obliged, at last, to call for one of the myrmidons of the prisons, whose business it was to rivet the chains of the galley-slaves. These operations took up several hours, in one of the most frequented parts of Paris, in the face of crowds of excited spectators, who cheered on the printers to stand for their interest and their rights, and who regarded the scene as what it really was, an outrageous invasion of private property at the mere lawless will of a tyrant. Every looker on regarded the case as his own, and left the spot full of indignation against the King, the Ministers, and all their subordinate agents, considering their conduct as no better than robbery or house-breaking, and fully resolved to second the editors and printers in manful defence of the Charter. The ‘ Palais Royal,’

says M. de Norvins,* 'recovered its orators, its popular readers: the old men of the Revolution, mixing in the groups, spoke to them with pride of their youthful years, and of the mighty revolutionary movements, which had proceeded from the same places, the same individuals,—of the terrible crimes, the sublime actions, which had overthrown monarchy and aristocracy, and given freedom to France.' Already the Police were beginning to be satisfied their efforts had now become of no avail, in opposition to an entire people; for, although they had orders to arrest the conductors and editors of newspapers for subscribing the celebrated Protest, in the disorder and confusion of the time they found it wholly impracticable. Well might one of the patriotic editors say, in a circular to his subscribers: 'Between *right* and *violence* the struggle cannot be protracted, and we shall soon see our *national flag* unfurled.' The press, in short, had done its duty unflinchingly, in early protesting against the government, in calling upon the people to maintain their rights, and in setting the first example of resistance, of self-sacrifice, and of defiance of tyranny and usurpation.

* Essai sur la Révolution, Française tom. ii, p. 434.

CHAPTER IV.

The Three Days.—Military Arrangements —Incidents of Tuesday.—Night of Tuesday.—The Citizens arm on Wednesday.—Marmont's Plans.—Deputation of the Citizens.—Movements of the Troops.—Conflict at the Hotel de Ville.—Retreat of the Troops.—Their Conduct.—Barricades of Thursday.—The Polytechnic School.—Position of the Garrison.—Combats.—Capture of the Louvre.—Evacuation of the Tuileries and of Paris.—Conduct of the People.—Their Losses.

It is one of the remarkable facts connected with the Revolution of the Three Days, that, when the Ministers were about to undertake the overthrow of the Charter, — when they might and should have known the temper and spirit of the nation, — no military preparations of any sort were made, but everything went on in the blind confidence of undoubting security.* Like the stupid ostrich, who is said to plunge her head in the sand and imagine she has escaped her pursuers because she had voluntarily blinded herself to them, Charles the Tenth rested tranquil in the royal idleness of his nature, under the fancied shelter of his own benighted ignorance. Hence it was that, until Tuesday morning, two days after the Ordinances were signed, no arrangements were made by the government to prevent a civil war, or to succeed in it if it should break upon them in spite of their preventive exertions.

In the *Moniteur* of Wednesday the 28th, appeared an ordinance conferring the military command of Paris upon Marshal Marmont, Duc de Raguse, dated Sunday, the 25th. But it is said

* See the numerous proofs of this collected in 'Paris and its Historical Scenes,' v. ii, ch. 3—6.

the ordinance was antedated; and, at any rate, on the morning of Tuesday the 27th, M. de Raguse was wholly uninformed of the condition of affairs; for he was actually stepping into his carriage at Saint Cloud to make an excursion into the country, when his aide informed him of the disturbed state of Paris the evening before, and thus prevented his departure. About noon of that day he was sent for by the King and invested with the command, which he actually entered upon at the Tuileries a few hours afterwards. These facts appeared in evidence in the sequel, when the Ministers were brought to trial before the Peers for issuing the Ordinances.

The exact state of the military force, at the disposal of Marmont, is also well ascertained by information derived from different sources. It consisted of the Guards, troops of the Line, and others, to the amount of about twelve thousand men. The Guards were composed, in the outset, of three Swiss regiments of infantry, having eight battalions and three thousand eight hundred men; of two regiments of cavalry, having eight squadrons and eight hundred men; and of an artillery force of twelve pieces served by one hundred and fifty men. There were four regiments of the Line, with eleven battalions, and four thousand four hundred men, who almost immediately professed themselves neutral, and who, if they did not aid the people, were certainly of little or no service to the King. There were also eleven companies of *Fusiliers Sédentaires* or Veterans, consisting of one hundred men each, who gave up their arms to the citizens instead of opposing them; and the Gendarmerie, horse and foot, one thousand three hundred strong. Of all this force, only the Guards and part of the Gendarmerie can be considered effective, amounting to about six thousand men,

on whom Marmont had to depend to meet the whole population of Paris, a brave and martial people, vehemently excited, many of them discharged veterans, capable at any time of affording an army of fifty thousand men at a day's notice, and dwelling in a city peculiarly fitted by its style of construction to be the theatre of civic warfare. And yet, had the Ministers possessed any forethought for the occasion, troops were to be had in abundance at Saint-Denis, Sèvres, Vincennes, Versailles, and other places near Paris, sufficient in number to have balanced, if not overcome, the extemporaneous levies of the citizen-multitude.

When Marmont arrived in Paris, the necessity of prompt measures for repressing disturbances in various parts of the city become urgent. Immense crowds of the laboring classes were collected in the region of the Palais Royal and of the Tuileries, and near the hotels of some of the Ministers; and, although armed only with bludgeons and stones, they treated with utter contempt all the efforts of the Police for their dispersion. The gendarmes rode up and down the streets and squares to no purpose; they were every where insulted and reviled. The citizens had now closed their shops, and an overwhelming multitude of men, all animated with the same hatred of the government, and openly proposing the most daring acts of resistance, inundated the streets in that most frequented quarter of the city. Thus far, it is true, they were only a mob; but they were gradually changing their character, and their reiterated attacks upon the Hôtel Wagram on the Boulevard des Capucines, the official residence of M. de Polignac, must have taught the Premier that what he saw was no transient ebullition of popular heat. Accordingly, at half past four o'clock in the afternoon, Marmont issued his orders to

get the troops under arms, and bodies of infantry and cavalry were hastily marched to the Place du Carrousel, the Place Louis Quinze, and the Boulevards. The regular troops were then, for the first time, called upon to take part in the passing events.

It being now late in the afternoon, and an hour when the great thoroughfares of Paris are always full of poeple, the crowd continued to increase by the influx of citizens into the narrow streets near the Palais Royal, until these became wholly impassable. The Police having endeavored in vain to open a communication by dispersing the mob, demanded the assistance of troops. In fact, one of the gendarmes had already been killed by the citizens. Hereupon small detachments of the Guard were sent to clear the streets, and preserve order in the vicinity of the Palais Royal especially, as apprehensions began to be entertained that the citizens would break open the shops of the gunsmiths and armorers, which abound in that region, and possess themselves of arms. It appears that the pieces of the troops forming these detachments were not generally loaded, and that they had orders to conduct themselves with moderation and temper, and not to fire unless they were fired upon by the people. One small detachment endeavored to *debouche* by the Rue Duc de Bordeaux, near the Tuileries, but was so closely pressed upon and pelted with stones, tiles, and other missiles, as to be held in check for a while. On the other hand the Guards endeavored to make way by riding among the people and striking them with the flat of their sabres.

Meanwhile another and stronger detachment had sought the Rue Saint Honoré by the Rue de l'Echelle, who were also arrested in their progress by the mass of people accumulated in the

Rue Saint Honoré between the two detachments. Here was the first example of a barricade, which was formed on a sudden by overturning an *omnibus*, one of the long coaches which ply from one part of Paris to another, and placing it across the street. Behind this off-hand entrenchment, the citizens received the summons of the Guards to surrender, and answered it only with a shower of tiles and pavement stones. At length the troops forced the barricade, and after two discharges in the air fired the third time upon the people, and finally drove them slowly along the street. Other detachments, sent to the Palais Royal, and further up towards the Bourse, fired repeated volleys upon the people, killing a few and wounding many. Thus, by reiterated attacks on the crowds of unarmed men, and especially by charges of cavalry along the narrow streets, encountered only by stones, glass, tiles, and so forth, thrown from the houses or from among the mob, the multitude was gradually thinned off early after night-fall; and at eleven o'clock the troops returned through silent and deserted streets to their quarters.

In these incipient operations of the military several things deserve separate attention. The citizens, it will be remembered, were not yet armed, in the proper sense of the word; they had no fire-arms, or anything to resist the attack of the cavalry or other regular troops; for sticks, sword-canes, or even pocket pistols were but poor means of combating with soldiers armed to the teeth. In fact, the citizens fought with the stones and other missiles found on the spot, and with nothing else. They were therefore a mob of rioters, not a revolutionary militia. Still, it seems that the usual ceremony of summoning them to disperse by the intervention of the civil magistrate, preparatory to a charge of troops, was wholly omitted. *Qua-*

lis ab incepto talis ad finem. The Ministers had embarked in a desperate attempt to revolutionize the government, and abolish all the guaranties of liberty; and they did not trouble themselves particularly about the forms of law, in riding down the unruly *badauds* of Paris.

The incidents of this day afforded, to each of the parties engaged, some valuable lessons, but the insurgent citizens alone seem to have turned them to profit. What, even then, at the opening scene of civil war, should have taught the King to recede, and revoke the obnoxious Ordinances, was the conduct of the troops of the Line. Surely the Ministers could not in reason hope to succeed, with all the moral force of France against them, and all the physical force also, except a few thousand men of the Garde Royale. Yet that such was the prospect before them, they might have inferred, if they had used their understandings, from the incidents of Tuesday. For at this time the troops of the Line plainly evinced their disposition to fraternize with their fellow-citizens against the crown. A detachment of the fifth regiment of the Line, which was marched into the Place du Palais Royal, was greeted with cries of good will by the people assembled there, and thus early engaged not to fire upon them if ordered. Nor does it appear that any of the troops of the Line, on service this day, co-operated to much purpose with the Guard.

Nevertheless, Marshal Marmont, misled by the apparent success of the first day's operations, and finding the city in a tranquil state in the evening, wrote to the King in the most encouraging language. M. de Polignac, on the contrary, although he is said to have participated in the delusion of the Marshal, took a very peculiar step in view of all the circumstances. Polignac gave

a dinner that evening to the members of the cabinet, who sat down to the council table at the Hôtel Wagram under the protection of a battalion and of several pieces of artillery. It was an extraordinary time to join in festivities, when civil war was breaking out around them in consequence of their violation of the Charter; and they must have felt like a band of conspirators, partaking of Catiline's bloody cup, — *humani corporis sanguinem vino permixtum.* At the close of this their last official feast, they signed an ordinance declaring Paris in a state of siege, and giving up its inhabitants to the horrors of martial law. It needed only this final act of tyranny to fill the measure of their infamy and fatuity, thus to consign over the capital of the Kingdom to military violence, suspending the operation of all civil authority within its limits. But as to the Parisians themselves, such an ordinance fell harmless at their feet; for they had already renounced the government from which it emanated, and no longer felt as if they could gain or lose by decrees, when they were fixed to try the issue of arms. And yet the Ministers rested content with the empty menace of an ordinance, instead of taking measures to prevent the citizens from obtaining arms and ammunition. It was represented to the government that the scattered guard houses about the city, and the armorers' shops, would inevitably be plundered before the morrow; and that the Arsenal and the powder magazine of Deux Moulins should be properly guarded to preserve them from the same fate. But the good genius of the nation prevailed, and lulled the Commander in Chief and the Ministers into inaction as fatal to their cause as it was extraordinary.

Some characteristic incidents, on the part of the citizens, terminated the evening of Tuesday

Desirous to expel the guard, stationed in the Place de la Bourse, the mob had set fire to the guard house, a small wooden building; and when the firemen came to extinguish the flames, they suffered themselves to be disarmed. During the evening the citizens exhibited in this square, and elsewhere in the city, the body of a man killed by the discharge of the guards in the Rue Saint Honoré, inciting each other to vengeance by the view of their murdered compatriot. They then proceeded to destroy the lamps which lighted the city, thus signifying as it were the end of legal order. It is to be remembered that the lamps of Paris are suspended from ropes stretched across the street, whereof such terrible use was made in the former Revolution. By the destruction of the lanterns the narrow avenues of Paris were given up to darkness and mystery, and the populace were left to the secure prosecution of their plans of preparation for the decisive movements of the ensuing day.

The citizens, as we have seen, retired on Tuesday evening, and left the streets in such apparent tranquillity, that Marshal Marmont was completely deceived. But everything was changed before the troops left their barracks the next morning. The National Guard and the tri-colored flag re-appeared together on Wednesday, and armed partisans succeeded to the mobs of the day before. Early in the morning, or during the night, the armorers' shops had been entered, the detached guard-houses had been plundered, the *Fusiliers Sédentaires* had given up their arms, the Arsenal had been captured, the theatres had made a distribution of muskets and other arms, and the magazine of Deux Moulins had furnished the insurgents with ammunition for the weapons which they procured from every accessible source. Even the Musée d'Artillerie was broken into, and the

antique arms of the days of chivalry, preserved in that curious collection, were plucked from the repose of ages, to mingle once more in war. Add to this quantity of arms obtained by hazard or force, or previously possessed by individuals, that forty thousand equipments had remained with the soldiers of the National Guard, at their disbandment a few years before; and we shall then conceive by what means an abundance of arms and munitions of war was on the instant placed in the hands of the Parisians.

Business, of course, except that of war, was completely at a stand. The shops were everywhere closely shut, and the windows fastened and barred, as if in serious preparation for actual siege. Handbills, of an inflammatory nature, had been profusely distributed during the night, or posted up in conspicuous situations, where they could easily be read, so as to supply the place of the ordinary journals. The tocsin was sounded, summoning every man to arm for his country, and to aid in ejecting the odious Bourbons from the power they had obtained by foreign force, and now dishonored by their tyranny; and the multitude came pouring in from the faubourgs, to swell the masses furnished by the swarming streets of the city. It was not long before the tradesmen of the royal family took down the royal arms from their doors to deprecate the fury of the armed citizens, and their example was followed by the notaries and other legal functionaries, whose offices exhibited the badges of royal authority. In fact the insignia of royalty were everywhere defaced or taken down, and when they were moveable, suspended to the lamp-ropes in scorn, or publicly burnt in heaps, amid cries of *Vive la Charte!* All Paris was now in open insurrection. They hailed, with enthusiastic acclamations, the appearance

of the tri-colored flag, which roused all their recollections of other days of glory, and was inseparably associated in their minds with the idea of national independence. They greeted it as the 'star of the brave,' as the 'rainbow of the free;' and they felt as if starting from a troubled sleep, when they beheld the long proscribed symbol of the Revolution floating once more to the breeze, the consecrated banner of a second struggle with despotism, under the auspices of the citizen soldiers of the National Guard.

It is to be observed, however, that nothing like combination or the influence of responsible leaders was yet discernible. The assembling hosts bore every species of weapon, some rifles or proper military muskets, many of them fowling-pieces, pistols, swords, pikes, and even much humbler means of offence and defence. It seemed to be a mere spontaneous outpouring of universal enthusiasm, a sort of instinct of opposition to the King and all who supported his authority, which stimulated young and old alike, from the spruce *bourgeois* who left his counter to have a shot at the Guards, to the hardy *operatives* of the faubourgs, who needed nothing but a fit occasion to convert them into brave and ready soldiers. But however deficient in the regular organization of war these men were, no one could doubt, who saw them, that the fate of the Bourbons was sealed. Strong parties began to march down from the Rue Saint Antoine and the quarter above the Place de la Bastille, who occupied the Quai de la Grève, and the contiguous Place de l'Hôtel de Ville, the Place du Palais Royal, and the other open spaces intermediate between those points, and hoisted the tri-colored flag on the towers of Nôtre Dame.

Marshal Marmont, it seems, who had left the

citizens to procure arms and make their arrangements unmolested since midnight, now began to take alarm, and to view the matter in its true light. At eight o'clock he wrote to the King a long letter, which miscarried, and again another of the same purport an hour afterwards, as follows:

'Wednesday, 9 A. M.

'I had the honor yesterday of making report to your Majesty of the dispersion of the groups, which disturbed the tranquillity of Paris. This morning they have again formed, more numerous than before. It is no longer a riot, — it is a revolution. It is of urgent necessity that your Majesty should adopt measures of pacification. The honor of the Crown may yet be saved. Tomorrow, perhaps, will be too late. I shall take today the same measures as yesterday. The troops will be ready at noon. I await with impatience your Majesty's orders.'

This note exhibits evident marks of having been written in considerable agitation, and under the influence of some despondency, or of great reluctance to proceed to extremities. Marmont had dispersed an unarmed mob the day before by charges of moveable columns in various parts of the city: did he intend to operate in the same way today against an armed militia, as daring as it was numerous? Such is the intention expressed in his despatch. Fortunately we possess an able and authentic account of the movements of the troops from the pen of M. Bermond de Vachères, a staff officer of the Guards, which affords a clear insight into the military events of the Revolution, and enables us to give a faithful view of the plan of operations adopted by Marmont. As for the delay of three hours in setting the troops in motion, the sole reason which can be assigned for it is the anxiety of the Marshal to prevent the effusion of blood, and to allow the King time to send back a pacific answer. No such answer came,

however, and accordingly the sanguinary work of war commenced.

Marmont's head-quarters were at this time atthe Tuileries, where, indeed, they continued until the Château was occupied by the citizens, and the contest terminated. This post was defended on the upper side towards the city, by means of six battalions of French Guards, with three squadrons of lancers and the artillery, who formed in order of battle on the Place du Carrousel; and on the side of the Gardens were two battalions of Swiss Guards occupying the Place Louis Quinze. Strong detachments were stationed at the Champs Elysées, to keep open the communication with Saint Cloud by the avenue and barrier of Neuilly. Three regiments of the Line, the 5th, 50th, and 53d, received orders to occupy the Place Vendôme, and so to stretch along from the Rue de la Paix by the interior Boulevards to the Bastille, thus constituting a line in force, which should embrace the whole semi-circumference of Paris on the northerly side. The remaining regiment of the Line, the 15th, was commanded to occupy the large squares of Sainte Geneviève, the Palais de Justice, and the Hôtel de Ville including the Quai de la Grève. His plan it seems was, after thus securing possession of the boulevards, quais, and places, to keep open a communication through the great thoroughfares of the Rue Richelieu, Rue Saint Honoré, and Rue Saint Denis, by detachments of cavalry or infantry charging upon the citizens as on Tuesday. This plan of operations has been vehemently criticised and censured since; and after an agitating crisis is over it is easy to say how things might have been done to greater advantage. In military events, especially, every body is wise when it is too late, and wonders that a multitude of things, apparently very sim-

ple,did not occur at the time to those,on whom responsibility devolved. Much of the reflection cast upon Marmont is nothing, probably, but this posthumous wisdom of disappointed men. And the simple truth, to be gathered from the different and often contradictory opinions of conflicting parties is, that the ultimate refusal of the four regiments of the Line to co-operate with the Guards in firing upon their compatriots, was the real cause of Marmont's failure in the successful accomplishment of his purpose. One half of his force, occupying the fixed positions, the *points d'appui* in the city, became, as we shall see, serviceable rather than otherwise to the insurgent citizens, and left the whole contest to the Guards.

The first rencontre between the citizens and the troops occurred unexpectedly at the Hôtel de Ville, before the Guards were put in motion. Between nine and ten Marmont sent a lieutenant and fifteen men to the Place de Grève* to ascertain whether the 15th regiment of the Line had arrived

* In the various accounts of the Three Days, the word Place de Grève occurs frequently, but it is not strictly proper. The Hôtel de Ville of Paris, is situated on the long side of a large square, which abuts upon the northerly bank of the Seine, and is called the Place de l'Hôtel de Ville. A new suspension bridge, called Pont de la Grève, crosses the river at this point. The Quai Pelletier opens into the square on the one hand, and the Quai de la Grève on the other. Near to the entrance of the bridge, and of course at one end of the square, is the place of public executions, where the guillotine is erected on such occasions. The entire locality is popularly called the Place de Grève, from the word *grève*, which means a strand or flat shore ; the name, as applied to that spot, being coeval with modern Paris, and undoubtedly derived from the natural condition of the bank of the river there, and its primitive use as a landing-place. The readers of Prior will remember his allusion to the particulars for which the square is now the most notorious.

'Who has e'er been at Paris must needs know the Grève,
The fatal retreat of the unfortunate brave.'

there. On entering the square this little detachment was immediately fired upon by the citizens, who killed one man and wounded several others, and would have cut off the whole body, but for the timely arrival of a battalion, which had afterwards been ordered to make a *reconnaissance* in the same direction. This incident has been greatly exaggerated in the accounts of the day, drawn up and published at the moment, without any knowledge of the plan marked out for the troops, and of course with a very mistaken idea of the object and direction of their movements. It is only remarkable as the opening scene of bloodshed on this day.

Noon having come without any orders from Saint Cloud, contrary to Marmont's hopes and desires, he was obliged to commence the course of active operations, upon which he had decided. Reserving only a small force to guard the Louvre and the Tuileries, and having posted the regiments of the Line as already stated, he divided his remaining force into four columns of about equal strength, for the performance of separate duties. The first column, of one battalion, two guns, and two squadrons of horse grenadiers, commanded by the Vicomte de Saint Hilaire, was to move from the Champs Elysées to the church of La Madeleine, and after following the boulevards to the Rue Richelieu to return to the Champs Elysées. The second column, consisting of a battalion of infantry, two guns, and three squadrons of cavalry, commanded by M. de Saint Chamans, was to follow the Rue Richelieu to the boulevards, and then, wheeling to the right, march by the boulevards to the Bastille, and thence return by the Rue Saint Antone to the Hôtel de Ville, where it was to meet the fourth column. Two battalions of guards with two guns and 30 gendarmes, under M. de Talon, were to proceed

to the Marché des Innocens: thence, one battalion was to diverge to the left up the Rue Saint Denis to the Porte Saint Denis, and then return to the Marché des Innocens, while the other battalion, which, in the meantime, was to diverge to the right as far as the Place du Châtelet, should have returned to meet it; and here they were to wait for further orders. The fourth and last column, consisting of one battalion of infantry, a half squadron of lancers, and two pieces of cannon, commanded by M. de Quinsonas, were to proceed along the quais to the Place de Grève supported by the 18th regiment of light infantry, and, being there joined by the second column, to maintain themselves in position at the Hôtel de Ville. The several detachments accordingly departed upon the services assigned them respectively; but before giving an account of their proceedings, it is proper to relate some incidents, which soon afterwards took place at the Tuileries.

Such of the Deputiés elect as were in Paris, had met repeatedly since the publication of the Ordinances, to consult on the course they should pursue. Some question exists as to the part acted by particular individuals among them, at the early stages of the Revolution. In Sarrans' Memoirs of La Fayette, especially, statements appear, designed to impeach the patriotism of MM. Casimir Périer, Dupin, Sébastiani, and others, who afterwards became leaders of what may be called the *conservative* party. It would appear that the liberal Deputies, actually in Paris, first met on the evening of Monday, at the invitation, and in the house, of Comte Alexandre de Laborde, where they again assembled on Tuesday morning, as also in the afternoon of the same day in the house of M. Casimir Périer; and during the Three Days of Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, in the hous-

es, first of M. Audry de Puyraveau, then of M. Bérard, and afterwards of M. Lafitte. MM. de Laborde, Villemain, and de Schonen attended the meeting of the journalists on Monday the 26th, as a Committee of Deputies. Sarrans imputes much hesitancy and uncertainty of purpose to M. Périer and his subsequent political associates, while he represents the conduct of MM. Lafitte, Mauguin and their friends as distinguished by a more decided manifestation of fearless patriotism.* But his work is deeply colored with party spirit;—it has been very pointedly contradicted also, in respect of these matters, by M. Dupin in a suppressed pamphlet of his;—and it is not very profitable to enquire which of the Deputies was the readiest to enter into civil war, and which would have chosen to avert it, since it is evident that, when hostilities were inevitable, M. Périer assumed his full share of public responsibility and hazard.

Between two and three o'clock in the afternoon, a deputation from Deputies assembled at the house of M. Audry de Puyraveau, consisting of General Gérard, the Comte de Lobau, and MM. Lafitte, Casimir Périer, and Mauguin, repaired to head-quarters to confer with the Duc de Raguse, and press upon him the importance of doing something to stop the effusion of blood. M. Lafitte, who spoke in behalf of the deputation, represented to the Marshal the deplorable state of the metropolis, declared in a state of siege, and treated like a town taken by storm, blood flowing in all directions; and declared that the assembled Deputies of France could not but consider him personally responsible for the consequences of a continuance of hostilities. The Marshal replied

* Sarrans, La Fayette et la Révolution de 1830, Histoire des Choses et des Hommes de juillet, 2de. ptie, ch. 2 & 3.

that he considered obedience to the royal commands a point of honor as a soldier, and asked for the conditions of armistice proposed by the Deputies, that he might report them to the King. M. Lafitte replied; 'Without judging too highly of our influence, we think we can be answerable that everything will return to order on the following conditions, namely, the revocation of the illegal Ordinances of the 25th of July, the dismissal of the Ministers, and the convocation of the Chambers on the 3d of August.' The Marshal answered, that as a citizen he might not disapprove, nay, might even participate in the opinions of the Deputies, but as a soldier he had his orders, and felt bound to carry them into execution. He was willing to submit their overture to the King; but proposed, as M. de Polignac was now in the Château, to go and request him to receive the deputation. After a short absence he returned with an altered countenance, and informed the Deputies that Polignac declined any conference, the conditions proposed rendering it wholly useless. In fact, the Ministers had fled from their respective hotels, and taken refuge at head-quarters, determined to persist in their folly and madness, amid the rattle of musketry, the roar of cannon, and the peal of the tocsin, with the tri-colored flag everywhere displayed before their eyes, regardless of the sufferings they inflicted on their country in the gratification of the senseless ambition of a tyrant. M. Lafitte, when he received the answer of M. de Polignac, took leave with the simple but impressive declaration: 'THEN WE HAVE CIVIL WAR.'

It would seem that until this time the citizens had entertained hopes of accommodation; and it is stated, in some of the memoirs of the Revolution, that the insurgent multitude did not feel

that it was a desperate case, until the deputation of their friends left the Tuileries. Meanwhile preparations had been made on a large scale for resisting the troops in their progress through the narrow streets. The paving stones were torn up, and carried to the upper rooms of the houses, to be hurled on the heads of the troops. Bullets were cast by the women in the shops and at the doors. Those who had arms of any kind stood ready to use them: those who had not, disposed themselves to employ such humble missiles as they could obtain, and to aid their brethren by their presence and acclamations in default of possessing the means of active co-operation. In these circumstances the projected movements of the troops began.

M. de Saint Hilaire's column performed the service allotted to them without difficulty, being marched through spacious streets not inhabited by a *belligerent* population. But their movement, as it was comparatively free of danger, so was it of no consequence in any point of view, — neither benefiting the King, nor injuring the citizens.

The second column marched up the Rue Richelieu through a dense crowd, but proceeded along the Boulevards without encountering much resistance as far as the Porte Saint Denis. Here they were fired upon from the houses, and even from the top of the arch of Porte Saint Denis itself. As the column advanced, the firing increased. When M. de Saint Chamans reached the Porte Saint Martin he found the opposition to his further progress so earnest, that he was obliged to countermarch his cavalry behind his infantry, which, thus unmasked, fired upon the citizens by platoons; and thus, with the aid of artillery, the column broke through the multitude and continued its advance. Meanwhile the citizens had begun

to erect barricades in this quarter, and although the troops surmounted them now, yet they were constructed so fast, that it would have been next to impossible for the troops to return the same way. As the column proceeded, they passed the 50th regiment of the Line near the Château d' Eau, or large fountain of the Rue de Bondi, where they had been stationed ever since the morning. Beyond this point, as they approached the Bastille through the Boulevard du Temple and Saint Antoine, they entered into a large mass of the workmen of the faubourgs, surpassing, both in boldness and numbers, the insurgents whom they had previously encountered. The troops advanced in close columns, sweeping the width of the boulevard, preceded by a party of soldiers ranged as sharp-shooters, who fired in the air and at the windows, their object being to prevent the latter from being securely occupied by the armed citizens. The large open space of the Place de la Bastille speedily became the scene of a sanguinary contest.

M. de Saint Chamans easily drove out the multitude to make room for his troops; but the citizens only withdrew to the houses and the numerous streets opening upon the square, from whence they maintained a persevering fire, which of course was returned by the soldiers. The column drove the people before it whenever the attempt was made, but was prevented from marching up the Rue Saint Antoine to the Hôtel de Ville as it had been ordered to do, by the barricades erected in that street, and by the hostility of the citizens, who not only fired continually upon the troops, but poured down upon them a perpetual shower of stones, tiles, glass, and articles of furniture, from the house-windows. Of course, many lives were lost in this quarter, and great

injury was done to the houses, by the discharge of muskets and field pieces. Finding it impracticable, at length, to complete the route assigned to him, M. de Saint Chamans crossed the river at the Pont d'Austerlitz, and as it were stole off to the Tuileries by the back way of the other side of the Seine. The citizens of the Rue Saint Antoine looked upon the movement of the troops in that direction as a triumph, and supposed that they had been recalled in consequence of the success of the insurrection at head-quarters. Thus nothing was accomplished by this column, which left the citizens in possession of the confident feelings of supposed victory, and also left them free to unite their strength to that of the insurgents in the heart of the city.

The operations of the third column ended still more unsatisfactorily. To reach the Marché des Innocens, they marched through the Rue Saint Honoré, where they were continually exposed to a severe fire from the windows, court-yards, and narrow streets or alleys along their route, and subjected to showers of paving stones and other missiles, to which, as marching in a dense body, they were necessarily much exposed. They were received with a sharp fire at the Marché itself, but soon made good their position, and prepared to execute their orders. M. de Talon lost no time in detaching a battalion up the Rue Saint Denis, but found it necessary to depart from the plan marked out for him, until the return of this detachment should make him feel strong enough to proceed down the Rue Saint Denis to the Place du Châtelet. Accordingly a battalion under Colonel Pleineselve made its way up the Rue Saint Denis to the boulevards. But in doing so, it suffered severely from the citizens, who, in this quarter, had always manifested a determined

spirit. They had erected so many barricades in this street, amounting, it is said, to thirty in all, that, although the troops surmounted every obstacle, and finally gained the Porte Saint Denis, it was a work of infinite labor and much time; and when they had reached the end of their appointed march, they found that the barricades had been renewed and strengthened behind them, so that it was impossible to rejoin their comrades, and at the same time the boulevards were equally blocked up on each side of them: by reason of which they were compelled to abandon the field, and return to the Tuileries by the Rue du Faubourg Saint Denis and the outskirts of the city.

Meanwhile the residue of the third column was left in a most perilous situation, in the Marché des Innocens, blocked up and harassed by a continually augmenting multitude of people, who were walling up the streets with barricades. Finding that his ammunition began to run short, the commander was compelled to despatch an aide-de-camp disguised in the dress of a citizen, to obtain relief. In fact, the troops at this point suffered more, and the conflict was more sanguinary, than at any other point except the Hôtel de Ville. The messenger succeeded in reaching head-quarters, and a battalion of Swiss Guards was immediately despatched to relieve the disheartened troops. The poor Swiss missed their way, as wiser men might easily have done, amid the blind alleys and crooked streets through which they had to pass; and they reached the Marché at last, barely in season to rescue the remains of the column, and conduct them back by the Place du Châtelet and the quais to the Louvre, where they took a position.

The three columns, whose movements we have followed, were engaged in a series of skirmishes,

which ended in defeating the whole plan of operations for the day, so far as they were concerned. The fourth column alone sustained a genuine battle. It was not anticipated, when they started from the Tuileries, that they were strong enough to perform alone the service on which they were sent; for the second column was to have joined them at the Grève, which both united were to defend against the citizens. But, as we have already seen, the second column was compelled to leave the fourth to its fate; and of course, when the latter reached the Hôtel de Ville, it found itself alone. They proceeded by the quais as far as the Pont Neuf, and there, instead of continuing directly to the Place de Grève, they crossed the Seine, and passed along the Quai de l'Horloge to the Marché aux Fleurs, which abuts on the Pont Nôtre Dame, a bridge a little to the westward of the Pont de la Grève, and opposite the Quai Pelletier, which opens into the Grève. The general decided to recross the river by the Pont Nôtre Dame, sending forward a detachment to make a demonstration by the Pont de la Grève. At the Pont Neuf he had found part of the 15th regiment of the Line, which, by virtue of orders from the Duc de Raguse, he required to support him in his movement on the Hôtel de Ville. One battalion of these troops of the Line, followed the Guards across the Pont Nôtre Dame, while others remained on the Marché aux Fleurs to observe that neighborhood.

Early on this day the citizens had entered the Hôtel de Ville, for the purpose of ringing the tocsin and hoisting the tri-colored flag. They did not attempt, however, to convert the edifice itself into a military position, but were contented with occupying the square and the neighboring streets. Here, in the course of the day, they had collected

in great numbers, and had become in a qualified degree organized, so as to act in masses and under the direction of leaders. When they saw the troops approaching, they marched forward, with drums beating, to occupy the bridge, by which the Guards were to cross the river. M. Bermond de Vachères, the commanding officer, caused his cannon to be brought to the middle of the bridge, and then rode forward himself to conjure the people to retire and give him free passage. But the citizens refused to hear him; and an adjutant having been killed at his side by their fire, he dispersed them by a discharge of grape shot, and occupied the Quai de Gèvres and Quai Pelletier at the termination of the bridge. In the mean time the detachment, which was to cross the Pont de la Grève, and which ought to have waited for the other detachment coming up by the Quai Pelletier, so that both should enter the Place de Grève together, had rushed on impetuously, and entered the square alone, where it was exposed to the whole fire of the people from the houses, the square, and the corners of the streets opening into it. At length the other division of the column came on to the support of their comrades, and they succeeded in gaining possession of the square, and for a time silencing the fire from the houses, although it was still continued out of one of the cross streets called Rue du Mouton, and from the opposite side of the Seine.

In the Rue Mouton the citizens had entrenched themselves behind barricades, and severely annoyed the troops on the square. The Guards charged up the street, and carried the barricade, but it was soon retaken by the citizens, who from time to time renewed their fire also from the houses. The Guards had reckoned on being supported in their position by the light infantry of

the Line, posted on the south side of the river. When, however, the Guards in the Place de Grève began to suffer from the fire of the citizens on the opposite quais, messages were sent to the officer of the Line who commanded there, and finally he refused to interfere. The consequence was that the citizens, secure behind the heavy stone parapets, which in Paris border the quais along the banks of the river, and protected in some sort by the soldiers of the 15th regiment, soon filled the Quai de la Cité, on which the suspension bridge of the Grève abuts, and kept up a well sustained fire on the Guards.

Such was the situation of things when a body of cuirassiers, which had been detached from the column commanded by M. de Saint Chamans for the purpose, came to announce to the Guards in the Place de Grève, that the long expected column had been obliged to return to head-quarters, instead of coming to their support. The cuirassiers had fought their way along through innumerable difficulties, and only succeeded in entering the Grève by means of a powerful diversion made by the column there, to assist them in doing it. The cuirassiers were followed by the 50th regiment of the Line, under M. de Maussion. They had voluntarily abandoned their position on the boulevards to return to their barrack; but finding it occupied by the insurgents, they had continued onward to the Grève, after an express engagement with M. de Maussion not to act against the Parisians, and were now placed in the interior court of the Hôtel de Ville. The commanding officer of the Guards, finding, after five hours of continual firing, that his ammunition began to fall short, now sent to the Tuileries for succor. A detachment of two hundred Swiss accordingly came to his relief; and in the movements necessary for

placing the Swiss in the position occupied by the Guards some confusion occurring, the citizens took advantage of it, and made a simultaneous attack on the troops from all points. Although repulsed by the murderous discharges of the Guards, the people continually returned to the attack, with the courage and perseverance of veteran soldiers, giving the Guards but little respite and no opportunity for repose, while the cavalry were perpetually exposed to the plunging fire of the citizens on the Quai de la Cité.

This state of things becoming insupportable to the troops, they determined to retire into the Hôtel de Ville, abandoning the defence of the square and its outposts. M. de Bermond says that the insurgents, *mistaking this movement for a retreat*, followed it up with another general attack. There was no mistake about it. There is no meaning in words if it was not a retreat. The ammunition of the Guards was wholly exhausted, and they were obliged to have recourse for a partial supply to the regiment of the Line, who were quiet spectators of the scene. The Guards were in fact *compelled* to take refuge in the Hôtel de Ville, where they would cease to be a mark for the sharp-shooters among the citizens, and could themselves fire upon the people from a sheltered post, while their horses were safe in the court-yard of the Hôtel. Here, therefore, the troops remained until towards night, when a disguised messenger arrived, and announced to them that they were to evacuate their position, and retreat to the Tuileries as they best could. It was concluded to wait until midnight, when it was presumed the Parisians would have retired to their homes, and then to retreat by the route wherein they had come, as the Conciergerie and other public buildings occupied a considerable space along the southern quais,

and of course the people were less likely to interrupt their march by firing from windows in that quarter, than from the closely inhabited tenements of the direct course by the Quai de la Mégisserie.

These troops were thus engaged for twelve hours, without any food, or any refreshment, except a few bottles of wine much diluted with water, which the soldiers bought of some wine-sellers on or near the square. The number of their killed and wounded is variously stated, but amounted, it would seem, to two hundred or two hundred and fifty in all.* The destruction of the citizens was undoubtedly much greater, as they exposed themselves unreflectingly, and were subject to the shot of cannon; but it is difficult to ascertain the exact number that fell at this particular part of the city. Many bodies were thrown into the Seine; and although, as will be seen hereafter, calculations were made as to the number of killed and wounded by the returns of the hospitals, and so forth, yet these calculations do not fix the extent of the destruction of life at the Hôtel de Ville But the bloodshed here was cheaply expended, the result of its effusion being all-important, because it was in fact a decided victory in itself, and in its consequence upon the royal cause. The Guards retreated at midnight, as had been arranged, and it was well for them that they did not longer delay their march, as the number of barricades was increasing every hour, and their return would

* M. de Bermond says there were 50 or 60 wounded *to be carried away* in the retreat. M. Delaunay, another officer, says the wounded amounted to 150 or 200 men. The difference is accounted for by supposing that M. de Bermond speaks of the badly wounded only, and M. Delaunay of all the wounded. M. de Bermond speaks of 40 men being *hors de combat* at five o'clock.

soon have been impracticable. They found the 15th regiment of the Line posted very tranquilly at the Palais de Justice and on the Pont Neuf, observing a patient neutrality in this war between Charles X, and the population of Paris.

Thus terminated the military operations of Wednesday the 28th of July. They had wholly failed of their intended effect on every point. Three of the four columns had been fairly beaten, or at least beaten off, in the enterprises they had undertaken. Whatever success they may have had in a military point of view, — for the Carlists flatter themselves with the consolation that *in a military point of view* the troops succeeded, because they made good certain positions for a time, — yet morally speaking they were totally and absolutely vanquished. There is no question about this in truth and in fact. They had attempted certain objects, and had been driven back to headquarters, leaving those objects but half accomplished at best, and the field of battle in possession of the insurgents. This would be called victory by all rational men, whatever the advocates of despotism, English or French, may see fit to term it. As for the first column, it did nothing, good or bad, and therefore does not vary the result. It should be added, that some irregular skirmishing occurred in the course of the day between the citizens and the Gendarmerie, or small parties of the Guards, in the Rue Saint Honoré, the Place du Palais Royal, and the Place des Victoires. Marshal Marmont himself having occasion to visit the Bank, had a narrow escape on the way. With the exception of these little skirmishes, the foregoing account of the movements of the four columns of the Guards exhibits all the fighting, which took place on Wednesday.

The fatigued and dispirited troops, who had

been contending all day under a burning sun in July without any nourishment, found that no arrangements had been made for provisioning them at head-quarters. By some extraordinary neglect, they were left destitute of supplies, when the government had the command of all the avenues to the city, and might have provided food in abundance. The insurgents, on the other hand, were plentifully supplied with every necessary, the whole city being anxious to succor the wounded and to relieve the wants of all. In the course of the evening, detachments of Guards came in from Versailles and Rueil, about one thousand seven hundred in number; but these, it is said, did not quite compensate for the losses which the garrison of Paris had already sustained. Much of the loss consisted of soldiers disarmed and dispersed at the different posts about the city before the combats began; the rest, of the killed and wounded in the various engagements. The Guards expected to have been received at the Tuileries by the King or the Dauphin, in whose behalf they had been all day fighting; but those worthy personages, it would seem, had been too busily occupied in hunting, to have time for thanking the ill-merited devotion of their household troops. Towards night the King was fully informed by the Duc de Raguse of the exact state of things by means of his aide M. de Komierouski, as well as by written communication. Marmont was anxious to impress upon Charles the necessity of some accommodation, as the sole method to preserve his crown. But the only answer the King gave was an injunction to the Marshal 'to persevere, to assemble his forces on the Place du Carrousel and the Place Louis XV, and to act with masses:' thus impliedly censuring the conduct of Marmont in dividing his forces, and scattering them over Paris.

The reader will have noticed that the conduct of the troops of the Line on this day was favorable to the insurgents. Their sense of discipline did not permit them to engage in the insurrection, while on the other hand their political convictions prevented their aiding the household troops. So early as Tuesday, a detachment of the 5th regiment, as it has been recorded in a previous page, entered into an engagement not to fire on the citizens, and was received by the latter with loud manifestations of applause. It is said that this same 5th regiment being ordered to 'make ready' to fire on the people on the boulevards, obeyed; and when the word 'present' was given turned their pieces on their Colonel, waiting for the order to fire. Whether this anecdote be true or not, certain it is, that the three regiments posted along the boulevards, fraternized with the people in a very short time, and only maintained their position, without offering any annoyance to the armed citizens, who continually greeted them with cries of 'Vive la Ligne!' The defection of the 15th was more signal, because they were in full view of the Guards on the Place de l'Hôtel de Ville, who stood in pressing need of their support. But all they did was to stand quietly where they were drawn up, gently keeping back the people when these pressed too closely, and complaining to the latter of remaining drawn up under a hot sun all day without meat or drink. The fact is, the soldiers of the Line heartily sympathized with the insurgent citizens, and the officers generally concurred with the liberal party in their opinions of the obnoxious Ordinances, and were contented with keeping their men tranquil without seeking to bring them into conflict with the Parisians.

Indeed the Guards should receive the credit of

having performed their bloody task with extreme reluctance, and a praiseworthy degree of forbearance, where this was consistent with obedience to orders, greatly to their honor. We have seen what took place on the Pont Nôtre Dame, before the troops fired; and the case was not a solitary one. In one of the popular accounts, it is stated that when the cavalry of the Guard charged for the first time, an officer cried out to the people, *with tears in his eyes*, 'For the love of God, in the name of Heaven, go to your homes.' When the Guards were ordered to fire from the Hôtel des Gardes on the Quai d'Orsay, they levelled their pieces above the heads of the people, so as to intimidate without inflicting injury. In the streets, they appeared to feel that they were performing a most painful duty, being evidently filled with gloomy anticipations of the future. It is also remarked of the cavalry that they displayed great forbearance on all occasions. The lancers, cuirassiers,and mounted gendarmes were engaged every where, and were the special objects of popular resentment, particular the lancers and cuirassiers, who were pertinaciously assailed in every possible way. In their frequent and furious charges, they were shot and bruised, and their horses killed or lamed under them, by bullets, stones, bottles, and other missiles, and they struck down many persons in return. Nevertheless, it is astonishing how few men were wounded, during the Three Days, by thrusts of the lance or sabre cuts. The cavalry also fired their pistols and carbines frequently, but still with little effect. The comparative inefficiency of their operations may be partly ascribed to the difficulties of their situation, but more to their feelings of humanity, and unwillingness to imbrue their hands in the blood of their fellow citizens.

Their aversion to the service on which they were employed, was not diminished by the events of that day. One of the officers of the Guard resigned his commission, in a letter to M. de Polignac, the acting Secretary of War, which deserves to be recorded for the manly sentiment it speaks. It is in the following words:

'MONSEIGNEUR:

'After a day of bloodshed and disaster, undertaken against all divine and human laws, and in which I have borne a part from a respect to human authority for which I now reproach myself, my conscience forbids me to serve one moment longer.

'I have in my life given too many proofs of my devotedness to the King, not to be permitted, without my intentions being calumniated, to distinguish between what emanates from him, and atrocities committed in his name.

'I have therefore the honor to beg you, Monseigneur, to lay before the eyes of his Majesty my resignation as Captain of his Guard. I have the honor to be, &c.

THE COUNT RAOUL DE LATOUR DU PIN.'

July 28, 1830.

While discontent, disaffection, and the conviction of being engaged in a bad and a losing cause, paralysed the royal troops, the Parisians were busy in confident preparations for renewing the contest on the ensuing day. They had seen the advantage of the barricades hastily thrown up by them during the agitation of battle, and they resolved to avail themselves to the utmost of the facilities, which the city afforded, for thus obstructing the evolutions of cavalry and artillery. No sooner had the Guards begun to recede, than all classes, ages, and sexes devoted themselves to the task of heaving up these ready fortifications. The pavements of Paris consist of large cubic stones broken into shape, and they were dug up and piled into thick walls stretching breast high across the streets. These heavy mounds were

surmounted or strengthened with barrels full of stones, and large beams and gates, while every species of carriages, the huge diligences of the Messageries Royales or of Laffitte and Caillard, the long omnibuses, fiacres, cabriolets, wagons, private coaches,—all were indiscriminately seized, and converted into ramparts to block up the principal thoroughfares. On the boulevards the fine trees, which adorned that noble avenue, were sacrificed in the cause of patriotism, and cut down to perform their part in the grand system of barricades, which now rendered Paris utterly impassable for horses or any kind of vehicle. In fact, the Guards were thus effectually shut out of the city, except the open spaces which they occupied about the Tuileries.

It is to be observed that Paris presents facilities, in the style of its buildings, for being put in a state of defence, far beyond the large cities of the United States. The inhabitants, of every class, are in the habit of residing in flats, so that a respectable family, instead of occupying all the parts of the building as with us, often dwells on a single story, with other families above and below it. Of course, they enter from the street by a single door, which is commonly a large *porte cochère*, opening perhaps into a court-yard, with the buildings in a quadrangle surrounding it. This common entrance is generally kept closed, and is always attended by a porter, whose business it is to open and shut it when occasion requires, and to receive the messages, letters, and so forth, intended for the families within. Thus it happens that the houses present to the street a solid defensible front, difficult of attack, and affording a safe shelter to marksmen, whence they may fire upon troops as they go along with hardly the least degree of hazard. In the narrow streets, where

the buildings are lofty, and inhabited by many persons in the humble walks of life, the peculiarities in their construction greatly favored the people, and were, in the same way, the source of much embarrassment to the military.

Thursday, the 29th of July, at length arrived. The tocsin had been ringing out its melancholy peal during the night, summoning the citizens to arm for this last day of the battles of liberty. Yesterday and the day before the indiscriminate populace of Paris, the small shopkeepers, artificers, and workmen of the faubourgs, had covered themselves with glory as the unofficered, undisciplined, unorganized soldiers of the Charter. Call them National Guards, or call them citizens, they were at any rate mere popular assemblages, without any responsible head, or any leaders, other than such as boldness of spirit and strength of body created on the spot. But today the aspect of things was changed. La Fayette, Gérard, Dubourg, Lobau, the veteran sons of the Revolution, wise in council and brave in the field, came forth to communicate vigor and character to the heroic efforts of the Parisians. The assembled Deputies of France had assumed the insurrection, and had given it their sanction as a movement of the French Nation. The *tri-color*, the proscribed badge of regicides and jacobins, the sacrilegious symbol of revolutionary fury, was now the livery of all in Paris, whether high or low, except the beleaguered Prætorian cohorts of the wanton violator of his oath, of the infatuated usurper of the liberties of his native country. Nor were subordinate leaders now wanting, to direct the mechanical operations of actual combat, inspiriting by their zeal, and organizing by their science, the brave bands of the barricades in these the closing triumphs of the glorious Three Days. The ar-

dent young students of the Schools of Law and Medicine, and the beardless boys of the Polytechnic School, had appeared occasionally in the scene on Wednesday, but in small numbers and as common combatants. Today they came forth in a body, particularly the young men of the Polytechnic School; and instantly gaining the confidence of the people by their manifest intrepidity and skill, they soon introduced a certain degree of regularity and of discipline among the soldiers of the Charter.

The Polytechnic School (Ecole Polytechnique) is one of the noble institutions, to which the Revolution gave birth. It was founded by a decree of the National Convention, in 1794, by the name of Ecole Centrale, and in the following year took the appellation it now bears; its great utility having secured to it the protection of every succeeding government in France subsequently to that time. Its principal object was to give instruction in those branches of science, which prepare for the pursuits of the engineer and the soldier. The ordinary mathematical and physical sciences, together with engineering, civil, military, and naval gunnery, and other departments of the application of abstract science to the arts of peace and war allied to these, formed the studies of the Polytechnic School. A large number of excellent officers, engineers, and scientific men have received their elementary education in this celebrated establishment. Pupils were admitted from the age of sixteen to twenty, and were allowed to remain two, and in some cases three years. Notwithstanding their youth, the nature of their studies and the discipline of the institution fitted them to act the part of leaders and officers among the untrained *bourgeois* of Paris.

The numberless advantages of Paris, as a place

of professional education, have rendered it the residence of great numbers of students of law and medicine. Although destitute of the military knowledge possessed by the students of the Polytechnic School, their general intelligence, their standing in society, and their earnest devotion to constitutional principles, made them no mean actors in the stirring scenes of the Three Days.

Obedient to the commands of the King, and taught by the experience of the last two days, Marmont concentrated his forces today in large masses in the neighborhood of his head-quarters. Whatever might have been his intentions if things had proceeded favorably, his actual operations were mostly of a defensive nature. The Guards at this time exhibited a force of eleven battalions of infantry and thirteen squadrons of cavalry, amounting to 4300 men. The four regiments of the Line still remained under the nominal orders of the Marshal, and notwithstanding their previous conduct, were considered by him in the general disposition of his forces.

To render intelligible the incidents of the day, we must explain the relative situation of the several positions occupied by the troops. The Seine, it will be remembered, flows from east to west through the heart of Paris. Three considerable islands are here formed by the river, the largest of which is the Lutetia of the Romans. 'Lutetiam profiteiseitur,' says Cæsar, 'id est *oppidum Parisiorum positum in insula fluminis Sequani*;' and this island is now familiarly termed *La Cité*. Upon it the Palais de Justice and the Cathedral of Nôtre Dame are situated; for it is not in the wilds of America only that a court-house and a church form the nucleus of the future city. The Quai de l'Horloge, Maréhé aux Fleurs, and Quai de la Cité compose the northerly edge of the isl-

and, facing the Quai de la Mégisserie, Quai de Gèvres, Quai Pelletier, and the Grève, the localities so often referred to as constituting the opposite bank of the northern channel of the Seine. The principal interior Boulevards describe a semicircle resting upon the river, of which the island of La Cité may be considered the centre, and which thus incloses the northern half and the most populous part of Paris. Surrounding the Boulevards thusdescribed, are the northern Faubourgs, beginning with the Faubourg Saint Antoine in the east and contiguous to the Bastille, and ending with the Faubourg Saint Honoré and the Champs Elysées in the west. The southerly half of Paris, on the opposite side of the Seine, is less regular than the other, but has a general correspondence to it in form and appearance.

At the westerly extremity, then, of the city, and adjacent to the northern bank of the river, are the Louvre and the Château of the Tuileries, which although bearing different names, are one connected mass of buildings; and in continuation onward from them are the Gardens of the Tuileries, the Place Louis XV, and the Champs Elysées, extending by the broad avenue of Neuilly to the gate or barrier of that name. The Palace of the Louvre forms a perfect quadrangle, inclosing a public court four hundred and eight feet square, which is entered by passing under spacious vestibules or arcades, one on each side of the Palace. The Tuileries consisted, for a long period, of what is now only the main body of the edifice, which comprises a range of buildings on a single line, extending on a ground plan 1068 feet perpendicular to the Seine. Of this range or block of buildings, the extremity next the Seine is called the Pavillon de Flore, and the Pavillon Marsan forms the opposite extremity. It fronts

on the Garden of the Tuileries, having its reverse, of course, towards the Louvre, with a large public vestibule or arcade passing under it, so as to constitute an avenue from the Garden to the Louvre. On the side of the river, a range of buildings stretches from the Pavillon de Flore to the Louvre, thus uniting the two Palaces, and forming the magnificent Galérie du Musée, or picture gallery, 1332 feet in length. Another range of buildings constructed by Napoleon, and facing the Rue de Rivoli, extends from the Pavillon Marsan about half way towards the Louvre, it having been his intention to unite the two edifices on this side also, as well as on the side of the Seine. The Cour du Palais, and the Place du Carrousel, on which stands the celebrated arch, are separated only by a gilded balustrade, and occupy the whole space within the two galleries or wings of the Tuileries. The residue of the space, between the Palaces, is open, or partly covered with ordinary buildings.

Receding a little from the river, and just north of the Louvre and the Tuileries, is the Palais Royal so called, the residence of the Duc d'Orléans, separated from the former by a few short cross streets, and having the Rue Saint Honoré between,—a long street, which, under various names, runs parallel to the Seine from the barrière du Trone on the east to the barrière du Roule on the west. The Rue de Castiglione crosses the Rue Saint Honoré at right angles, making a communication from the Garden of the Tuileries to the Place Vendôme. On the other side of the Seine, leaving the Place Louis XV by the Pont Louis XVI, you come successively to the Palais Bourbon, occupied in part by the Chamber of Deputies, and in part as the residence of the Duc de Bourbon Condé, to the Hôtel des Invalides with

its extensive esplanade and grounds, and to the Ecole Militaire fronting upon the Champ de Mars.

It is far from the present purpose to give a description of Paris, or of any of the different objects above designated, all that is intended being, to make military operations intelligible by pointing out the situation of certain points with reference to those operations. The troops were distributed at the various positions, as follows. A battalion of Guards occupied the Ecole Militaire. The grounds of the Invalides were left to the defence of the school for staff officers. The Palais Bourbon was entrusted to the Line, who also extended to the Place Louis XV and the Garden of the Tuileries. Three battalions of Guards also formed in the Garden. A Swiss battalion was posted in the Place du Carrousel, another in the interior court of the Louvre, and a third in the colonnade and windows of the Louvre itself. Two battalions of Guards were distributed at different posts along the Rue Saint Honoré, some in the houses, others at the Palais Royal and the Bank of France, which is near it. Two others extended from the Place Louis XV along the Rue Royale to the church of La Madelaine and the Boulevard des Capucines. The cavalry were chiefly in the Champs Elysées or about the Tuileries.

All these arrangements, as above intimated, were apparently defensive in their object. Marmont had, in compliance with the injunctions of the King, concentrated the troops in masses all around the Tuileries; and in so doing he might continue to maintain that position against the people. But what then? The Nation was now in arms; and what could a few thousand guards accomplish against the whole of France? Would the Ministers counsel the King to bombard Paris?

If they intended effectually to treat it as a besieged city, the question would have come to that; and then it would have been advisable for M. de Polignac to ascertain whether he could find troops of the Line enough to invest Paris in regular siege, and carry matters to the extremity of destroying the metropolis. It is well known that no such orders would have been submitted to by any of the regular troops. What then, once more, could Charles hope to effect by means of his 'masses?' It is impossible to see anything of a more practicable nature in the operations of Thursday than in those of Wednesday, notwithstanding the generosity and good sense of the Carlists, who are disposed to cavil in every way at the proceedings of Marmont, and to throw on him the blame of a failure, which arose out of the intrinsic rottenness of the cause itself.

Let even-handed justice be dealt out to all parties. A blind, infatuated King attempted to suppress the liberties guaranteed to the nation by the fundamental law of the land. Weak and narrow minded counsellors became the dishonorable agents of his usurpation and perjury. They made no fitting preparations, in fact, ne preparations at all, to compel obedience to the unlawful decrees of their master. When the day of trial came, and a revolution had already commenced, they called upon a Marshal of France to command the forces which garrisoned the capital, in the expectation that he would achieve an easy victory over a yielding mob. He made such a disposition of his troops as the views of the time recommended to him, and he failed, because his forces were inadequate to accomplish his purpose, and because the despised mob proved to be a brave and warlike host. Whether the plans of Marmont were judicious or not, is wholly immaterial. Whatever they had

been, and however fortune might have favored their execution, their success would but have caused greater effusion of blood: for all France, including the army itself with the exception of the Guards, was against the King, and sooner or later he must have yielded to numbers, notwithstanding any temporary advantage he might have enjoyed in his attack on the Parisians. The King and his Ministers should therefore bear the blame of their folly and insanity in the entire transaction, and in each and all of its parts, instead of meanly seeking to throw the responsibility of the failure upon Marshal Marmont. His real error was of a political not of a military nature; it consisted in his undertaking the task of dragooning the citizens into submission, not in his failing to accomplish it.

But to return to our narrative, — these arrangements of the troops having been made, the people themselves became the assailants, in the movements of the day. The fire of the Parisians had slackened the night before, owing to the want of ammunition; but today they had obtained an abundant supply from the powder magazines of Essonne, — which, under the exigency of circumstances, was hastily brought into Paris in bags like grain, but fortunately without the occurrence of any accident. The armed citizens surrounded the various points of Marmont's line, and maintained an incessant discharge of musketry upon it from every quarter. Their exertions were particularly directed to the Louvre and the Tuileries, the centre of the royalist position, which they endeavored to carry by repeated assaults, conducted with the bravery and pertinacity of veteran soldiers. Sheltering themselves under the parapet walls along the southern bank of the river, and standing even behind the pillars of the Institute,

which is on that side of the Seine and opposite to the Louvre, they fired with comparative impunity upon the troops stationed at the latter edifice. The citizens fought with equal resolution, but at great disadvantage, on the other side of the Louvre toward the Palais Royal, particularly from the square of the church of Saint Germain l'Auxerrois.

Early in the day the officer of the Line, who commanded at the Palais Bourbon, entered into negociation with the citizens, which resulted in his peaceably withdrawing his troops into the garden of the Duc de Bourbon, leaving the insurgents in possession of a post, which commanded the Place Louis XV. They retained it for some time, greatly to the annoyance of the Guards, on whom they could now fire from the shelter of the columns in front of the Chamber of Deputies and from other points of the edifice. The troops of the Line stationed in the Place Louis XV, soon retreated to the alleys of the Champs Elysées, without returning the fire, and a body of Guards was compelled to march across the Pont Louis XVI, and dislodge the citizens from the Palais Bourbon. When they had done this, they found the regiment of the Line in the garden of the Palace, keeping entirely aloof from the combat. At about the same time two regiments of the Line, stationed in the Place Vendôme, shouldered their muskets with the buts in the air, and abandoned the Marshal to his fate. When Marmont received intelligence of this additional defection, he became satisfied that a continuance of hostilities was perfectly idle, now that his two wings, which composed half his force, had deserted him, leaving his centre to sustain the war alone; and he proposed an armistice, in the hope that an accommodation might yet be made with the King

that should put an end to the insurrection.

M. de Sémonville, a peer of great authority and influence, who held the office of grand referendary of the Chamber of Peers, — an office created for managing the pecuniary and business affairs of the Chamber,— had repaired to the Tuileries this morning, in company with M. d'Argout, another peer, to insist in the name and behalf of the Peers, that conditions of accommodation should be procured from the King. The wishes of Marmont, as before observed, were decidedly adverse to the course he had been required to pursue, and no man was more anxious than he to bring about peace. M. de Sémonville maintained the same ground, which M. Lafitte had taken in his interview with Marmont the day before. But this energetic nobleman went further than to demand of the Ministers that they should resign. He proposed that they should be arrested on the spot if they refused to resign; and the Duc de Raguse appeared half inclined to comply, but declined at length: Whereupon M. de Sémonville drove post to Saint Cloud in order to represent to the King the true state of his affairs, and the urgency of immediate concession. Thither, also, the Ministers repaired at the same time. They left the Tuileries just before the defection of the troops of the Line; and Marmont had such confidence in their success, that he distributed a pacific proclamation, conjuring the citizens to lay down their arms in the prospect of immediately obtaining all they demanded. But an unexpected and most important advantage was just then obtained by the citizens, which accomplished a total change in the whole aspect of affairs, and decided the question forever against the reigning dynasty.

Marshal Marmont, it will be recollected, had posted three battalions of Swiss Guards at the

Louvre, one in the colonnade and galleries, and another in the Place du Carrousel, that is, under the windows of the Galérie du Musée. The position of the two Palaces, thus occupied, has been considered impregnable by the best military judges, and was so pronounced on this very day by competent persons, who examined it without having any interest in the question to bias their opinions. When the regiments of the Line deserted their stations in the Place Vendôme, a post so important on account of the access it gave to the Tuileries, the Marshal hastily ordered one of the battalions of Swiss, from the Louvre, to supply the place of the revolted troops. The Louvre was already garrisoned rather inefficiently, considering how hotly it was attacked by the citizens; and the battalion, which occupied the building itself, was absolutely indispensable to the defence of the position. It happened, unfortunately for Marmont, that the Swiss, in the Louvre, were commanded by the Comte de Salis, the officer who lost his way the day before in going to the succor of the troops in the Marché des Innocens, and who seems not to have possessed a very clear understanding. By an extraordinary error in judgment or singular mistake of his orders, this officer, instead of sending either of the two battalions in the courts, marched off the very corps, which alone defended the Palace itself.

The Parisians, of course, immediately perceived that the firing from the Louvre had ceased, and pressed their attack with renewed zeal. Finding still that they encountered no opposition, they at length crowded in at the lower windows, and took possession of the whole interior of the edifice, first occupying the windows which overlooked the inner court, and then the Galérie du Musée, which commanded a long space beneath, as far

along as the arch of the Carrousel and the court of the Tuileries. Suddenly the Swiss, in the court of the Louvre, found themselves exposed to a deadly fire from the windows of the Palace above them, and struck with a sudden panic they fled in disorder into the Place du Carrousel. At the same time the Parisians opened their fire from the Galérie du Musée. Filled with consternation at the continuance of the unexpected fire from all the windows of the Louvre, the whole body of Swiss rushed precipitately into the railed court of the Tuileries among the lancers drawn up there, followed close by the fire of the Parisians. All was now confusion. The Swiss thronged towards the arched vestibule under the Tuileries, which leads from the Place du Carrousel into the Gardens, overturning every thing before them, and converting what at first was only a retreat into a wild disorderly rout. But here, at this very vestibule, were the head-quarters of the army, and here was the Marshal himself. Marmont was carried along, surprised and astounded by the precipitate retreat of his own troops, and hastily made his way into the Garden, where the flying battalions again formed. But the day was irretrieveably lost. Seeing the troops waver, the citizens pressed on from this side, and Marmont was obliged to order his troops to evacuate the city, and retreat with all possible despatch upon Saint Cloud.

Marmont was driven so suddenly from the Tuileries that he had no time to remove the military chest, or to take any measures to preserve his outposts from destruction. The detached parties of Guards in the Rue Saint Honoré, in the barrack of the Rue de Babylone, and elsewhere, who knew nothing of the events at the Tulieries, were overpowered, and many of them killed by the trium-

phant citizens, who thus gained absolute possession of all Paris. The citizens rushed into the Tuileries, as promptly as they had entered the Louvre, and the princely halls of the Château, its rich dormitories, and the secret cabinets of royalty itself, were speedily filled with the profane crowds of the populace of Paris, and the People were now in reality the sovereigns of France. Charles had, ere this, recalled the illegal Ordinances and accepted the resignation of his Ministers; but all too late; for while he was deliberating on the subject the reign of the Bourbons had ended, and the sceptre had passed away from their hands. A revolution, as glorious in its consequences as in its achievement, had been accomplished in the short space of three days, and France was free.

It would greatly exceed the reasonable limits designed for this work, to relate the individual traits of patriotism and heroism, which ennobled the Revolution of the Three Days. The newspapers and popular publications of the day have abounded with anecdotes of the self-devotion of boyish students, the common workmen, nay, the women of Paris, which would have done honor to the spirit of old Romans. But the course of our narrative confines us to the leading incidents and the general results of the contest. The bravery of the citizens has been so frequently signalized in the preceding pages, that it need not be dwelt upon here. But we should do the Parisians extreme injustice not to note the spirit of good order, of obedience to the laws, of deference to the rights of person and property, of courage tempered with mercy, which distinguished their conduct throughout these trying scenes. The government did everything in its power to introduce anarchy and confusion. It wantonly violated the Charter. It declared Paris in a state

of siege, thus silencing the ordinary courts of justice, and substituting the arbitrary will of a soldier in the place of the regular movement of the laws. But the People were more virtuous than the King. In the midst of the heats and violence of civil war, the citizens respected private property with as much sedulous care as if the laws had possessed their accustomed vigor. No private resentments were prosecuted, no booty was unjustly acquired, during a period, when unbridled license would have seemed to be the order of the day. The citizens took possession of arms wherever they could find any; but neither the treasure of the Bank nor the riches of the Tuileries could tempt them to lose sight of the high and noble purpose, which animated them in the great controversy, now put to the issue of war. The meanest individual seemed to feel that he was fighting the battles of the Charter, and the feeling exalted him above the scope of every lowly passion, rendering him as high minded in principle as he was courageous in conduct.

On the other hand, however, it is necessary that we should carefully exercise our judgment, in considering the events of this period, to avoid being misled into false views. No American would seek to detract from the merits, or to disparage the sufferings and sacrifices, of the brave Parisians during the ever memorable Three Days. Nor could it be desired that so noble a triumph as they achieved, so grand a revolution as they accomplished, should have been achieved or accomplished at a greater loss of human life than actually occurred. Still it must be avowed that the exaggeration and rhodomontade of the popular accounts of the engagements of the Three Days pass all bounds. The whole effective force of Marmont, as we have seen, never exceeded six

thousand men; and on Wednesday the 28th, when the real battle of the Revolution was fought, this force was cut up into detached columns, which engaged separately with large masses of citizens. The conflicts in the Place de l'Hôtel de Ville were the most desperate and sanguinary of the whole day. And yet, after all, there were but a thousand men here of the royalist troops. But the terms of grandiloquence applied to the discharges of so small a force would shame a bulletin from the field of Borodino, or any other scene of terrible carnage, where death has gathered up his victims by hundreds not by units. Undoubtedly the hyperbolical extravagance in question is to be pardoned to mere civilians, who were unused to scenes of blood, and who really displayed as true courage and gained as imperishable glory, as if the bloodshed of the Three Days had been answerable to the horrors of a pitched battle between contending empires. But while we pardon, we cannot but condemn it, as an unworthy trait in itself, and as tending greatly to impair the credibility of the early accounts of the Revolution. These accounts are extremely inaccurate in many respects, as they give no complete idea of the Three Days, even where they are substantially true, and as they state many important things as fact which never took place. The repeated capture and recapture of the Hôtel de Ville, the storming of the Louvre and of the Tuileries, — these are half-imaginary incidents, which appear in bold relief in newspaper articles of the time and in other equally authentic sources of information. Some of the sketches published would represent the loss of the troops as being greater than the whole number of troops engaged in the contest. But it is not so. In fact it has been pretty satisfactorily ascertained that the loss on both sides did not ex-

ceed two thousand men in killed and six thousand in wounded. Deducting, however, whatever is exaggerated in the popular statements concerning the Revolution, enough of glory remains to the Parisian population, and enough of consequence in the victory achieved, to render it one of the most interesting events in the modern history of Europe.*

CHAPTER V.

Provisioual Government of Thursday.—La Fayette.—Proposals of the King.—The Duc d'Orléans made Lieutenant General.—State of Paris.—Expulsion of the Bourbons.—Remarks.

We have now passed in review the military events of the Three Days, which in so brief a period completely destroyed the power of Charles Tenth. But in the emergency of a popular revolution, it is often easier to destroy than to renew,

* In describing the movements of the troops during the Three Days, I have relied mainly upon the accounts of them given by M. Bermond de Vachères. The American reader, who seeks for more detailed facts on the subject, may find them in Hone's 'Full Annals of the Revolution,' in the translation of the French 'Evènemens de Paris,' and in the work entitled 'Paris and its Historical Scenes,' — all which have been printed in the United States. Much authentic matter touching the same week may be collected, also, from Turnbull's 'French Revolution,' the works of Rossignol, Mazas, Sarrans, and others among the French, and especially from the 'Procès des Ex-Ministres.'

easier to overthrow existing institutions than to establish new ones in their place. Fortunately on the present occasion the People, who for the time being had resumed their natural authority, were temperate and judicious in their views, and after they had fought for and won their liberty, gave up their arms, and returned peaceably to their ordinary pursuits, leaving to the chosen and respected public men of the nation to reorganize the forms of government. The *Moniteur*, that expressive chronicle of political changes, did not appear on the 29th. Being the organ of the rulers *de facto*, who may happen to have the control of affairs, how could it speak on that day, when there were no rulers? It was an *interregnum* alike of the Government and of the *Moniteur*. But on Friday it reappeared under the dates of July 29th and 30th, with the following official article:—

'PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT.

'The Deputies, present at Paris, have found it necessary to assemble to remedy the serious dangers, which threatened the security of persons and property. A Commission has been appointed to watch over the interests of all, in the entire absence of a regular organization.

'Messrs Audry de Puyraveau, Comte Gérard, Jacques Lafitte, Comte de Lobau, Mauguin, Odier, Casimir Périer, and De Schonen, compose the Commission.

'General La Fayette is Commander in Chief of the National Guard.

'The National Guard are masters of Paris at all points.'

These few sentences proclaimed to France and to Europe, the triumph of the Charter and the downfal of its assailants, — in short, a successful Revolution.

The individuals, composing the Commission, were universally known as the uncompromising advocates of the popular cause on occasions without number, and their names were a sufficient guaranty to the people at large of the character

of the measures they would pursue, even had not La Fayette been announced as commander of the National Guards.

In fact, to the population of Paris these appointments were not a novelty. No longer restrained by considerations of delicacy, or any fear of compromising themselves, the Deputies, assembled at the house of M. Lafitte on Thursday, made various arrangements of great importance. M. Lafitte's dwelling was become the point of union for the Deputies and the insurgent multitude. 'It was an unheard of spectacle,' says M. Sarrans, 'those sumptuous apartments of his encumbered with riches, those tables loaded with plate, that bank of millions, that incessantly shifting throng of strangers, workmen, soldiers, rich and poor, circulating amid such countless wealth, without the abstraction by them of so much as a crown piece or a coffee spoon, although under the temptation of assured impunity.'* Hither the people of the Barricades flocked for ammunition: — here were patriots from the country, receiving the brief but expressive advice, — 'Push forward the insurrection, and if need be, come to the succor of Paris.' While the citizens were fighting the battles of liberty in the streets, the Deputies were providing new depositaries for the functions of public authority. In placing La Fayette at the head of the National Guard, they had appealed to the old sensibilities and historical recollections of the people, in the same way the popular leaders of Wednesday had done in raising the tri-colored flag. La Fayette and the tri-color were equally, under the Bourbons, proscribed memorials of the Revolution. Immediately on receiving his appointment, he announced his acceptance in a proclamation, invit-

* La Fayette et la Révolution de 1330, tom. i, p. 272.

ing the Mayor and Municipal Committee of each arrondissement of the city to send officers to the Hôtel de Ville to rceeive his orders. It was soon after announced that the Comte Alexandre de Laborde was appointed provisional Prefect of the Seine, and Baron Louis Minister of Finance.

Previously to the nomination of La Fayette, General Dubourg, yielding to the solicitations of some of the citizens, had suffered himself to be installed in temporary command, and had established his head-quarters at the Exchange. He deserves the credit of being the first individual of rank and name, who assumed public responsibility as a chief in the movement of the people. Early in the day, also, a proclamation was placarded in Paris, subscribed 'Les Députés de la France,' announcing that a provisional government had been appointcd, and that MM. the General La Fayette and Gérard and the Dukc of Choiseul had undertaken its functions. This paper, it appears, was issued at the suggestion of M. Caffin d'Orsigny in order to encouragc the pcople in their efforts, the signature of 'Deputies of France' and the names of MM. La Fayette, Gérard and de Choiseul being used without any authority from the partics. The Duc de Choiseul, although apprised of the circumstances, sympathized so far in the patriotic struggle, that he was content to incur the hazard of being ranked as one of the ringleadcrs of an insurrection, rather than by publishing any disavowal to throw discouragement on the efforts of thc Parisians.*

The Municipal Commission being installed at the Hôtel de Ville, that place became the seat of public affairs once more, as it had been in former

* Histoire de la Révolution de 1830 et des Nouvelles Barricades, par MM. Rossignol et Pharaon, p. 141.

times of revolution. In fact, in every thing the days of popular rule seemed to be restored. But it was by the lavish use of the name, influence, and exertions of La Fayette that order was in reality maintained. He was replaced over the citizen soldiery which he had led in 1789. His name was invoked by the Deputies in their proclamation as the talisman of public safety. And he again was put forward along with the Provisional Government, which the exigencies of the time called into being. Never was more honorable tribute paid to the popularity, integrity, patriotism, and self-devotion of any man in ancient or modern times, than in the spontaneous resort of the casual depositories of power to La Fayette, as the only individual in France, whose personal influence could supply the total absence of an established or admitted government derived from the laws. In the unpretending form of Commander of the National Guard, he in fact exercised the functions, which, in ancient Rome and in the Republics of South America, would have belonged to the name and authority of Dictator.

When M. de Sémonville arrived at Saint Cloud, he could persuade the infatuated King to listen to arguments of accommodation only by awakening his apprehensions for the safety of the Duchesse d'Angoulême, who was then on her return from a journey, and knew nothing of what had transpired. His fears that a single member of his family might suffer, outweighed, in his selfish mind, all consideration of the lives of his subjects and the miseries of a protracted civil war; and to these fears, not to any principle of public good, he yielded himself up, in consenting to recal the fatal Ordinances and appointed a liberal cabinet. The Duc de Mortemart, who was on service at Saint Cloud as captain of the Guards, was made Prime

Minister, and empowered to select his colleagues. He began by naming Comte Gérard Minister of War, and M. Casimir Périer Minister of Finance; and these nominations appear in the *Bulletin des Lois*, although they never found their way into the *Moniteur*. M. Collin de Sussy repaired to the Hôtel de Ville on the part of M. de Mortemart, bearing the new Ordinances, with a view to effect an accommodation with the victorious party. He found installed there the Municipal Commission in the full flush of victory; and to the King's proffers of concession, he received for answer,— IT IS TOO LATE. There was no longer any hope for Charles or his dynasty; and these were the consolatory tidings transmitted to Saint Cloud.

The Carlist writer, Alexandre Mazas, gives a graphic account of the interview between M. de Sussy and La Fayette on this occasion, which probably is correct in the main, and strikingly illustrates the state of public affairs. M. de Sussy began to explain the object of his mission. MM. de Lobau, Mauguin, and Puyraveau, apprehending the whole thing at once, repelled the Ordinances without ceremony, M. de Puyraveau exclaiming repeatedly,—'C'est trop tard, c'est trop tard.' La Fayette, as he is accustomed to do, proceeded with more moderation. At the urgent solicitation of M. de Sussy he wrote M. de Mortemart a brief note, referring him to M. de Sussy for a full statement of the result of the interview. He then passed from his cabinet into the contiguous hall, where a large number of persons were assembled, leaving the door open that M. de Sussy might see and hear what transpired. La Fayette beginning to read the Ordinances aloud, was interrupted by a general outcry from the bystanders; but he requested them to hear the whole, and then freely manifest their opinion. Scarcely had

he completed the reading, when the most violent exclamations greeted the ear of M. de Sussy. — 'What wretch has brought us these Ordinances?' they cried: — 'Throw him into the Seine: — *Plus de Charles X, plus de Bourbons, plus d' Ordonnances.*' La Fayette then very coolly returned to M. de Sussy, saying: — 'You see the effect produced by the simple reading of these papers, and you can now bear my answer to M. de Mortemart.'

Among those who had the control of public affairs at this time, the general sentiment already pointed towards one individual, who alone could give consistency to the Revolution, by embracing the popular cause as his own. The Duc d'Orléans united in his person a multitude of considerations, all marking him out as the personage whom France now needed at the head of her government, to give consolidation and respectability to the new order of things, and assure to it the confidence of Europe. It was a consummation to which, as before explained, all eyes had long been looking, as a possible if not a probable event. Perhaps in this case, as in many other great changes which history records, the anticipation of this result had a decided influence in leading to its accomplishment. It is true that many of the victorious party desired pure republican forms, in place of monnarchy of whatsoever degree of liberality. Others there were, who still proudly cherished the name of Napoleon, and urged that the dynasty of Victory and the Revolution should be restored to power in the person of the Duke of Reichstadt. But the great current of opinion, — and in such a crisis opinion is everything, — ran in favor of the family of Orleans.

As the wealthiest subject of France, the Duc d'Orléans possessed that hold on the public regard, which great riches, worthily and liberally

employed, are calculated to impart. His rank placed him next to the reigning family, and of course drew attention to him whenever the subject of a substitute for the elder branch of the Bourbons came to be discussed. The Duc d'Orléans, it will be remembered, was lineally descended from Philippe, only brother of Louis XVI, from whom Charles X derived his descent, the common ancestor of the two families being Louis XIII, son of Henry Quatre, the splendor of whose qualities had perpetuated his memory in the hearts of the French, in spite of all the odium attached to the misrule of his posterity. At the same time, as the Duc d'Orléans had no claims to the succession, so long as the Dauphin, or his nephew the Duc de Bordeaux, or any legitimate posterity of theirs, survived, the elevation of the former would be a revolutionary act, a violation of the *jus divinum* principle, a departure from the line of hereditary succession; and therefore the Duc d'Orléans would owe his crown to the choice and free will of the French Nation, just as much as if he were a mere soldier of fortune elevated by his bare personal merits from the subaltern duties of the camp, and the indiscriminate ranks of the people. If he ascended the throne, it must therefore be by compact, and on such conditions as the public voice should see fit to impose.

And whatever recommendation the Duc d'Orléans gained by his proximity to the royal family, he derived a still greater one from his immediate parentage, his education, his own personal character, and the qualities of his family. The son of the Montagnard Philippe Egalité, who contributed more than any other single individual to heave Louis XVI from his throne, inherited a revolutionary taint in his blood, from which no elements of royal relationship in its composition could pu-

rify it, — and was thus driven from the affections of the restored royal family into unavoidable sympathy with the nation. At an early age, the then Duc de Chartres, with his two younger brothers, was entrusted to the tuition of Madame de Genlis, who conducted his education entirely upon the plan of Rousseau's Emilius, thus giving a hardihood to his body and a masculine freedom to his mind, which seldom fall to the lot of modern princes. Having completed his education, he joined the famous Jacobin Club in 1791, and during the same year entered into active service as colonel of a regiment in the army of the North. In that age of hard fighting and rapid promotions, the Duc de Chartres did not languish for the want of employment or honors. Through a quick succession of engagements in the spring and summer of 1792, under Biron and Luckner, he rose to the rank of lieutenant-general, and in September commanded the second line of Kellerman's army, at the battle of Valmy. Soon afterwards he joined Dumouriez, and participated in the brilliant though brief career of that general, commanding his centre in the great battle of Jemappes, and being equally distinguished to the close of the campaign.

The family of Orleans becoming subject to the proscription of the National Convention, on account of the suspicions awakened by their family connexions, the Duc de Chartres fled into banishment, and unfolded a still brighter page in his character to the eyes of the world. Refusing the tempting offers of military rank made him by Austria, because he would not bear arms against his country, he nobly disciplined his spirit to a life of humble security, and submitted manfully to the necessity of employing a part of his time in the duties of a village schoolmaster in the Grisons. The fall of Robespierre somewhat bettered his condi-

tion, by enabling him to enter into correspondence with his friends, and he then passed several years in travelling about Europe, chiefly on foot. During his wanderings in the North of Europe, he was recognised, and again received the offer of military command, and again refused to bear arms against his country. Meanwhile he had become Duc d'Orléans by the death of his father; his two brothers, the Duc de Montpensier and the Comte de Beaujolais, having continued imprisoned in France. But in 1796 the Directory offered to liberate the brothers, on condition they should all retire to America. The Duc d'Orléans gladly accepted this condition, and immediately embarked for the United States, where he arrived in 1796, and was soon joined by his brothers. They remained in America several years, examining our country, studying its institutions, and acquiring the esteem of our most distinguished citizens. In 1800 they went to England, and resided at Twickenham in honorable poverty, nobly refusing to live the dependant pensioners of a foreign government at war with France, or to participate in the petty intrigues of the little court at Hartwell. In 1807 the Duc de Montpensier died of consumption,* and the Comte de Beaujolais being threatened with the same disorder, he and his brother repaired to the Mediterranean. At Malta, soon after landing, the Comte de Beaujolais died; and from this period until the Restoration the Duc d'Orléans resided chiefly in Sicily, where he married a daughter of the House of Naples.

* The Duc de Montpensier was buried in Westminster Abbey, in Henry the Seventh's Chapel. At the exhibition of Somerset House in 1830, one of the most beautiful objects of sculpture was a monumental statue in marble of the Duc de Montpensier, executed by Westmacott (No. 1170,) a memorial of the continued regard of his surviving brother.

Previous to the Hundred Days, he held a high command in the army, under Louis XVIII; but since the second Restoration he had been living altogether in retirement, improving his estates and educating his family. How far this seclusion was forced upon him by the jealousies of the reigning family, does not distinctly appear; but that it was owing to this, in part at least, is evident from his not having acted in the Chamber of Peers. There are two articles touching this point, one of which is said to have been inserted by Louis XVIII with special reference to the Duc d'Orléans and his family. One of these (Art. 30) provides that 'The members of the royal family and the princes of the blood are Peers by right of their birth;' the other, (Art. 34) that 'The princes cannot take their seats in the Chamber but by order of the King, expressed for each session by a message, under pain of the nullity of everything which may have been done in their presence.' While the admission of the Duc d'Orléans to the Chamber depended on the caprice of the Ministers, he could exercise influence in the State only as a private individual; and he seems purposely to have kept aloof from the contests of party, except so far as the conduct of himself and family was a continual expression of sympathy with the Revolution. The more exalted, it is true, of the liberal party complained that the desire of the Duc d'Orléans to prosecute certain territorial or pecuniary claims of his on the government prevented his acting openly in the Opposition. The support he afforded to some liberal measures had given displeasure to Louis XVIII, and led to his receiving an intimation from that King, that it would be judicious for him to abstain from all part in public affairs. Had he resisted, and thrown himself warmly and publicly into the ranks of the Oppo-

sition, he would have proved a dangerous enemy of the government, by whomsoever it might be administered. But without his doing this, his entire life and his well known sentiments spoke for the part he would take, when a proper occasion should arrive.

Undoubtedly the decaying domestic condition of the reigning family, as compared with that of the House of Orleans, contributed to augment the unkindly feeling, with which this liberal minded and patriotic prince was viewed at the Tuileries. He was looked upon by the King and the Dauphin as a collateral heir, preparing to step into the heritage of their expiring line. The Dauphin and Dauphiness were old and childless; and saving the Duc d'Angoulême, only a boy of uncertain health kept from their hereditary throne the descendant of the unscrupulous Regent, the son of the more ambitious and less scrupulous Egalité. While the fear of the contamination of liberal principles, added to the not less anxious fear of assassination, consigned the Duc de Bordeaux to the seclusion of private tutors amid the luxuries of royal life, the five sons of the Duc d'Orléans were gaining a manly education and gathering 'golden opinions' at the ordinary schools of Paris. His oldest son, especially, the Duc de Chartres, was a noble, promising youth, who collected upon himself those enthusiastic tributes of popular esteem, which seemed to belong to an heir of the crown rather than a mere prince of the blood.

Taking into consideration all the circumstances thus developed, how could France fail to rest her hopes upon the Duc d'Orléans? A prince of the blood, his father had been an ardent promoter of the Revolution. He had worn the revolutionary cockade, and combated under the tri-colored banner with distinguished honor. He had constantly

refused to fight against his country, although, like the emigrant bands on the Rhine, he was an outlawed exile deprived of rank and wealth. He had passed the weary years of banishment in manly independence, earning his bread like a *roturier* when it was necessary, and exhibiting in his adversity the highest traits of moral courage, fortitude and true dignity of spirit. Restored to his titles and estates, and in the enjoyment of the vast income of his family, he had lived among his fellow citizens fifteen years, beloved for his private virtues, honored for his past life, esteemed for the liberality and soundness of his principles, and looked to as the probable future stay of his country. What wonder, when the Revolution of the Three Days had raised an impassable barrier, had placed a gulf of blood between the King and the People, that all eyes should have been turned towards the Duc d'Orléans as the pre-ordained Chief of the Nation?

While the contest raged in Paris, the Duc d'Orléans kept himself concealed at his country seat of Neuilly, situated a few miles out of the city. It is perfectly clear that he is free from any imputation of having fomented insurrection, or otherwise taken steps to bring about the contingency that had occurred. What private relations he may previously have had with the liberal party does not appear; nor is the fact material to the present question. It is self-evident that neither he nor any body else but the King and his advisers are really to blame for the actual occurrence of the Revolution. It has been justly remarked that, ' To have plotted effectually against Charles X, he must have conspired with his confessors to make him a bigot, with his Ministers to make him sign the fatal Ordinances, and with his troops to massacre his subjects with musketry and grape

shot.' In fact, the Duc d'Orléans concealed himself from all but his family, until the battle of the Barricades had been fought, the Guards were driven from Paris, and the fortune of the reigning dynasty had become irretrievably desperate. Thursday night the Deputies determined to place the authority for the time being in his hands; and giving ear at last to their pressing entreaties, he returned to Paris on Friday, and committed himself past recal to the cause and the consequences of the Revolution.

Early on Friday a paper was circulated, printed at the office of the *National*, the leading journal of the victorious party. It was in these words:

'ORDRE OFFICIAL.

'Vive la Patrie! Vive la Liberté! Vive la Charte! Et á bas Charles Dix!

'Vive le Duc d'Orléans, notre Roi!'

Indeed, whatsoever might have been the wishes of individuals, many reflecting men even of the republican party, who desired only the greatest good of the greatest number, were of opinion that all the substantial advantages of a commonwealth would be attained by calling the Duc d'Orléans to the throne upon satisfactory conditions, which they had the full power to stipulate. It was understood that La Fayette and his colleagues of the Extreme Left, were content, on receiving certain guaranties for the public liberties, to agree to his nomination. The views of the majority of the leading individuals in the Chamber were expressed in an article of the *National* of Friday, which may be regarded as an authorized exposition of their sentiments:

'After fifteen years of odious and dishonorable rule, the House of Bourbon is for the second time excluded from the

throne. The Chamber of Deputies has today pronounced this grand resolution, by calling the House of Orleans to the Lieutenant-Generalship of the Kingdom.

'This satisfaction was due to the French People, who have endured, during fifteen years, a Government incapable, vexatious, prodigal, and injurious to the country.

'For fifteen years France has not been at liberty to pronounce with eulogium the glorious names of the men who delivered her in 1789. The Revolution was held to be an act for which the country was bound to repent, and to ask pardon. France was obliged to apologize for having wished to be free.

'The brave men of the old army were almost compelled to find an excuse for their victories, or were forced to receive from foreign hands the confirmation of their glory.

'France was subject to the command of incapable degenerate princes, nowise in harmony with the spirit of the Nation.

'The throne was destined to pass from a feeble and obstinate father, destitute of any kind of knowledge, to a son without intelligence, and unacquainted with the interests he was to direct.

'The future was as gloomy for France as the present.

'Finally, this deposed family shed seas of French blood for the cause of usurped power, — that comprehended in the Ordinances.

'But punishment was not long delayed. The Ordinances subversive of our rights appeared on Monday; this day, Friday, the forfeiture is pronounced.

'The Chamber felt the necessity of establishing a Government in lieu of that overthrown. We need a prompt, vigorous, and active organization. Situated in the centre of Europe amid a number of powers, we require firm and stable institutions. The Republic, which has so many attractions for generous minds, succeeded ill with us thirty years ago. Exposed to the rivalry of the generals, it fell under the blows of the first man of genius, who tried to make himself its master. What we want is that Republic disguised under a monarchy by means of representative government. The Charter, always the Charter, with such modifications as reason and the public interest indicate.'

Similar observations were made in the *Globe*, from which we extract only the following passage:

'The Republic has but one fault, which is, that it seems not to be possible in France. Perhaps it may one day be-

come possible, perhaps it is the definitive Government to which all nations are advancing; but its time has not yet come. The heroes of the last few days exclaimed *Vive la Charte!* What was meant by that cry, which inspired such noble conduct? May the Charter, developed and amended by victory, prove equivalent for the Republic! — Supposing this point decided, the next question is, to whom shall the throne be given? The name of the Duc d'Orléans presents itself. The necessity of speedily establishing a Government is universally felt. The Duc d'Orléans is among us, and his situation is such that he may be the means of pacifying France, and saving us from the hostility of the rest of Europe.'

The wish prevailing at Paris, therefore, was sufficiently manifest in favor of the Duc d'Orléans, with such constitutional stipulations as should secure the rights of the people. The only inquiry with him could be whether any deference was due on his part to the rights of the young Duc de Bordeaux. This, to be sure, is rather a question of transcendental morals; for rarely can men be found, who, in such a contingency, would thrust from themselves a proffered crown, out of tenderness for the conflicting pretensions of a distant kinsman. But there are two considerations, which are conclusive on this point.

The Nation had resolved to depose, and had deposed, not this or that individual, but a dynasty. It was the whole family of Artois, which they were determined to be rid of once and forever. The battle of the Barricades had settled their fate just as decisively and definitely as the battle of Waterloo had done that of Napoleon. The Revolution was over, and the controversy disposed of, before the Duc d'Orléans was called upon to decide as to his own course. Now, in the first place, as a matter of expediency, the Duc d'Orléans could adopt no other alternative, because, had he sought to make any reservation in favor of young Henri, he would only have drawn down ruin on his own head. The Nation were at irreconcilea-

ble war with the whole House of Artois, and nothing but the inoffensive life of the Duc de Bourbon Condé and the personal popularity of the Duc d' Orléans and his children saved them from partaking in the sentence of proscription, which had gone forth against the posterity of Robert of Bourbon. By assuming to protect the rights of the Duc de Bordeaux, the Duc d'Orléans would have rendered his own expulsion from France just as sure as that of the royal family. France would in that case inevitably have become a Republic, probably with La Fayette for President; for young Napoleon had no strong party among the intelligent classes, and setting aside the princes of the blood, what other human being could aspire to be Chief in France?

In the second place, as a matter of principle, when the Duc d'Orléans put on the tri-color, and clambered over the barricades to make his way to the Palais Royal, he gave up the whole reigning dynasty alike, on adopting the Revolution.—Charles Tenth had attempted a gross usurpation. He had made war on his subjects in support of the attempt, thus voluntarily submitting the question to the trial by battle, and been vanquished, after making his own issue, choosing his own tribunal, and his own mode of trial. He had appealed to the *ultima ratio*, and spontaneously deprived himself of redress, by taking a decision at the point of the bayonet. Here, of course, was an end of his case. The stake for which he played was absolute power; the forfeiture which he stood pledged to incur if he failed, was dethronement and exile; and how could the destinies of the boy Henri be separated from those of his grandfather and uncle? In the contest of the Three Days the principle of the royal right of usurpation encountered the principle of the popular right of revolu-

tion, and the latter was victorious. It was said among the ancients, that victory is the visible sentence of the gods delivered on the field of battle, in favor of the party they protect; and who, — in a country with free institutions derived from the same source, to wit, successful revolution, — will deny that in the battles of the Three Days the righteous cause prevailed? And supposing the Duc d'Orléans to take the same view of the subject, as all the acts and opinions of his life prescribe that he must have done, it was impossible for him to make any distinction in behalf of the Duc de Bordeaux, because a rising in his favor would have been an abandonment of the principle of the Revolution.

We hold, therefore, that the Duc d'Orléans acted a righteous no less than a wise part, in buckling on the honors, which the decrees of Providence, the infatuation of the reigning family, and the spontaneous voice of the nation, unitedly devolved upon him. It is affirmed that Charles X and his advisers at Saint Cloud, anticipating that the Duc d'Orléans might become the rallying point of the revolutionists, had commanded a body of troops to arrest him at Neuilly, at the very time when the Deputies in Paris were preparing for his reception there. If it were so, he fortunately escaped from the hands of his good cousin to meet the wishes of the people. Early on the morning of Saturday, July 31st, he had an interview with a committee of the Deputies, and in the free conversation that ensued between them, as reported afterwards by Comte Sébastiani, he expressed his love of order and the laws, an ardent desire to spare France the scourge of civil and foreign war, the firm purpose of securing the liberty of his country, and his wish to make the Charter, which had been so long a delusion, a reality at last.

These feelings and purposes were embodied by the Duc d'Orléans in a Proclamation, which he issued at noon the same day, in the following words:

'INHABITANTS OF PARIS: The Deputies of France, at this moment assembled in Paris, have signified to me their desire that I should repair to this capital to exercise the functions of Lieutenant-General of the Kingdom.

'I have not hesitated to come and share your dangers, to place myself in the midst of your heroic population, and to exert all my efforts to preserve you from the calamities of civil war and of anarchy.

'On returning to the city of Paris, I wore with pride those glorious colors, which you have resumed, and which I myself long wore.

'The Chambers are about to re-assemble: they will consider of the means of securing the reign of law, and the maintenance of the rights of the Nation.

'The Charter shall henceforth be a truth.

'LOUIS PHILIPPE D'ORLEANS.'

It is not remarkable, that in the agitated and excited state of the population of Paris, this proclamation should have produced a great and a varied sensation among those, who were not in the secret of the political movements of the Deputies. A large portion of the citizens, excited by the triumph they had achieved, and filled with just indignation, were distrustful of the whole House of Bourbon. When the Proclamation appeared, it was objected to for a reason which may now seem slight, but which derived consequence from the unsettled state of public affairs. The victorious people, little considerate of the etiquette belonging to the forms of such a document, demanded why it was not countersigned by the Municipal Commission, or by La Fayette, as a sort of *imprimatur*, a certificate of genuineness, an indorsement of its true derivation from those trusted patriots, in whom the soldiers of the Barricades reposed confidence.

The Deputies assembled at M. Lafitte's at one o'clock to receive the report of the Committee, which had conferred with the Duc d'Orléans, and to take measures for officially making known to the people what they had done. The Duc d'Orléans had been called to the post of Lieutenant General: this his own proclamation made known. But by whom was he called, for what purpose, and under what conditions? All this it was important the people should satisfactorily understand; for the Deputies had no legal authority as a constituent portion of the State, to do any act whatever. It was only as individuals, having personal claim to the popular confidence, that the Deputies could expect obedience to their acts; and it was only by the pressing exigency of the existing *interregnum* that they were justified in assuming to create a provisional government. On the third of August they would be a Chamber, and would have constitutional authority as such; but now they could interpose only as an informal assembly of the most respected individuals in France. Conscious of these facts, they began by taking steps to win the approbation of the people to the revolutionary power of the Duc d'Orléans; — of that People, who, with arms in their hands, were the admitted depositaries of the supreme authority of the nation, and who seemed rather disposed to follow the political guidance of their own Commission at the Hôtel de Ville, than to look to the Palais Royal or the Deputies for advice or direction.

The Deputies speedily agreed upon a proclamation to be addressed to the people in their behalf, declaratory of the views they entertained in making the Duc d'Orléans Lieutenant General. France, say they, is free. Despotism raised its standard, but the heroic population of Paris had

overthrown it, and what France now needed was a government, which might be able to secure to the country the advantages it had acquired. With this purpose they had invited the Duc d'Orléans to assume the executive functions for a time, as the only sure means of peaceably accomplishing the work of the Revolution. They added, that the Lieutenant General would respect the rights of the people, because from them he would derive his own; and that, while entrusting him with power, they should make assurance of the strength and durability of their freedom, by the most satisfactory guaranties. These guaranties were the re-establishment of the National Guard, rendering the officers elective; the intervention of the citizens in the formation of the municipal and departmental administration; trial by jury in the affairs of the press; a thoroughly organized responsibility of the public servants; the situation of the military legally secured; and the re-election of Deputies appointed to offices in the administration of government.

It was then concluded that, to calm the popular effervescence, the Deputies should repair in a body to the Palais Royal, and personally communicate with the Lieutenant General and with the citizens. The Deputies hastened thither, headed by M. Lafitte, their temporary President, who read the proclamation of the Duke in the presence of his colleagues. How far the Duke may have been sincere in the cordial assent he gave to the principles of the proclamation, men question; but certain it is that he expressed, in his language and manner, the warmest approbation of the views of the Deputies, and especially of the several guaranties, which they stipulated for the rights of the nation, and the maintenance and developement of its liberties. His words, his

gestures, and his physiognomy, says one of the contemporary accounts of the scene, contended in expressing satisfaction and pride in being associated with them in the regeneration of constitutional order. At the very time when the Deputies arrived, the Duc d'Orléans was preparing to go to the Hôtel de Ville alone and on horseback, in order to present himself before the National Guards. It was immediately proposed and agreed that the Deputies should accompany him, in a body, to the head-quarters of liberty and popular right; and the importance of the interview there had, between the Duc d'Orléans and the party of the Revolution represented by La Fayette and the Municipal Commission, renders it worthy of detailed notice.

Out of the fermentation of public feeling consequent on the splendid victory of the Three Days, many parties had of course arisen, each desiring the establishment of a system of government conformable to their respective opinions. The names of Napoleon and the Republic resounded in the public ear, from those brave men of the faubourgs, who had gained the victory, from those high spirited youths, who had led on the soldiers of the Barricades. The boldest democratic doctrines were loudly discussed, and propagated by handbills placarded at every corner. The first idea, the idea that would naturally occur to the victors, was to ascertain the national will by taking the suffrages of the whole people of France, in the manner designated by the Constituent Assembly. Men, who entertained such views, could not but look disapprovingly on the proceedings of the Deputies, in undertaking to confer the functions of Lieutenant General on the Duc d'Orléans with the intent of subsequently elevating him to the throne. These men contended that the provis-

ional Government, which derived its authority immediately from insurrection and the victory of the Barricades, was bound to continue in the exercise of the power thus conferred by circumstances, until the future destinies of the country had been submitted to the voice of the people. They went further, and affirmed that France did not want, nor would it have, a king, but republican institutions similar to those of the United States. And they contended that, at any rate, if the Duc d'Orléans was to be called upon to reign, it should be after adopting a new constitution, and submitting to the people the question of his election.

On the other hand, it was contended by the great majority of the liberal Deputies, then in the very zenith of their popularity as the persevering and at length successful defenders of the Charter, supported by the great body of persons who felt anxious for the restoration of public tranquillity, that it was of urgent necessity to organize the government with all possible despatch. They urged that nothing was more certain to awaken divisions and propagate discord among the members of the victorious party, than to attempt the reestablishment of republican forms, which had so often been tried in vain in France. They represented that the sudden proclamation of the Republic would spread alarm in the Departments, and serve as a pretext for malecontents to stir up intestine war. And was there not just cause to apprehend that the reestablishment of the Republic in France would provoke another coalition-war against her, on the part of those jealous propagandists of despotism, the crowned heads of Europe? If a war against France should be kindled by her enemies, they would be glad of such a pretext for invading her territory, and would compel her to sustain immense sacrifices before she could ex-

pect to triumph over their combined hostility. Considering all these things, considering, as La Fayette himself has expressed it, the impressions left in France by past vicissitudes, the nature of existing circumstances immediately surrounding them, and the internal situation of the country, it appeared to the great mass of those individuals who gave direction to public opinion, that the choice of the Duc d'Orléans, and the establishment of a new dynasty with an amended Constitution, promised better for the order, welfare, and liberties of the country, than the Republic. Still, new conditions were indispensably necessary to be incorporated in the organization of the reconstructed Monarchy; — and the settlement of these conditions constitutes what has been termed the *programme* of the Hôtel de Ville, of which so much has since been said. And the tenor of this *playbill*, this rehearsal of the constitutional drama to be enacted, has been since distinctly explained by the organ of the republican party, La Fayette himself.

It is, in fact, undeniable that the Municipal Commission at the Hôtel de Ville, and the Deputies in their legislative hall, constituted, with La Fayette at the head of the first, and Louis Philippe of the second, each the centre of a party adverse the one to the other, being the types and originals of the two great sections of opinion, which ever since have contended for the control of public affairs in France. At the Hôtel de Ville were now the men of the Barricades themselves, the directors of the physical energies of the time, they who had thrown themselves into the crisis, careless of political hazards, or rather resolved to protect their necks from the guillotine by pushing out a popular insurrection to the issue of a full and consummate revolution: — at the Palace of the

Deputies were those who had more at stake and less of democratic vigor in their purposes and character, many of whom would gladly have listened to terms of accommodation with Charles had terms come in season, and who anxiously looked to the Duc d'Orléans as the only means of preserving the monarchical principle from being utterly crushed and destroyed by the armed bands of the Republicans.

The Deputies and the Duc d'Orléans made their way slowly and laboriously through the streets, which still remained blocked up with barricades, in the scorching heat of a summer's sun, and at length reached the Hôtel de Ville. They were received there by La Fayette, as commander of the National Guard, and as the representative of the men of the Barricades, a cortège of the young heroes of the Polytechnic School standing around him in the *salle d'armes*, or great hall, of the Hôtel. La Fayette conceived that the authority and popular confidence, with which he was invested, gave him the right, and made it his duty, in the course of the interview, to explain himself frankly in the name of the people, to the candidate for the throne. 'You know,' said La Fayette, 'that I am a Republican, and that I regard the Constitution of the United States as the most perfect which has existed.' — 'I think with you,' said the Duc d'Orléans; 'it is impossible to have passed two years in America, and not to be of this belief; but do you deem it expedient to adopt it, in the situation of France and according to the general opinion?' — 'No,' replied La Fayette; 'what the French People wants at this moment is a *popular throne, surrounded by republican institutions.*' — 'It is exactly as I understand it,' answered the Prince. — This mutual engagement, which, says

La Fayette,* may be appreciated at its value, but which he hastened to make public as embodying the conditions of the new social compact, had the effect of uniting together both those who did not wish for a king at all, and those who wished for any other but a Bourbon. La Fayette and the Duc d'Orléans then went to a window hand in hand, and looking out upon the assembled multitude in the square below, the People of France as it were in proper person, they waved from the window a tricolored flag as the symbol of liberty and concord, amid the acclamation and applauses of the congregated men of the Barricades.

Imagination can hardly picture to itself a more sublime and splendid spectacle than that of this venerable Apostle of Liberty, the good and great La Fayette, treading under foot all aspirations after power in his own person, regardless of the tempting glory of becoming President of a French Republic created by himself, bidding farewell to his party predilections, — to the enthusiastic visions of his country's liberty, perhaps, which had cheered him on through his chequered career in the battle fields of America, in the spirit stirring scenes of the first Revolution, in the dungeons of Olmutz, in the protracted seclusion fixed on him by the Empire for whose honors he was too pure, in the disheartening struggle against foreign power and ministerial duplicity which followed the Restoration, — sacrificing everything, all the cherished principles of his long life, from the unwil-

* Lettre à ses Commettans, written in 1831. — It was reported that La Fayette said at the same time, — 'Voila la meilleure des républiques;' — but he has contradicted a statement so much at variance with his known sentiments. What he actually said was: — 'Voila ce que nous avons pu faire de plus républicain.' — Sarrans, tom. i, p. 331, note.

ling conviction that it was demanded for the peace and tranquillity of France. Nor was the occasion, the manner in which the surrender was made, less remarkable than the sacrifice itself. La Fayette stood not in the attitude of a fortunate soldier, using the authority of military power to control the current of the public deliberations, and throwing his sword into the lighter scale as the balance of reason oscillated before his eyes. He did not occupy the position of a popular demagogue, a Roman Gracchus, or a Flemish Von Arteveldt, pursuing purposes so mixed in their nature, that whether private ambition or public interest predominated it might be hard to say, and giving the potent energies of a resistless democracy a direction inward upon the heart and vitals of their own motherland. He appeared there, on the ancient theatre of the *communes* of Paris, amid scenes hallowed by the triumphs and saddened by the abuses of freedom, himself the embodied personification of the liberal and republican opinions of France, the representative of a great principle not of a party of men, making sacred stipulations in behalf of that principle, as the condition of suffering the liberties of his country to pass under the guardianship of an hereditary prince.

In consequence of the proceedings at the Hôtel de Ville, all opposition to the authority of the Lieutenant General ceased. The functions of the Municipal Commission of course came to a close at the same time, and Commissioners were appointed to fill provisionally the several departments of Government. General Gérard was appointed to the department of War, M. Dupont de l'Eure to that of Justice, the Duc de Broglie to the Interior, Baron Louis to that of Finance, M. Bignon to that of Foreign Affairs, M. Guizot to that of Instruction, and Admiral de Rigny to the Marine.

When the Duc d'Orléans assumed the executive authority, La Fayette resigned the command of the National Guard, but was prevailed on to accept it again, in order that the new government might enjoy the sanction of his venerated name. The first measure of the Lieutenant General had been to issue an ordinance containing the single provision: — 'The French Nation resumes its colors. No other cockade shall henceforth be worn than the tricolored cockade.' Thus ratifying the spontaneous act of the citizens, and rendering it a part of the law. At the same time another ordinance appeared for the regular convocation of the two Chambers on the 3d of August, the day originally fixed for that purpose by the dethroned King. Some other incidental measures were taken in accordance with the spirit of the times, of which the most remarkable was an ordinance repealing the numerous condemnations for political offences of the press, discharging from arrest all persons confined for such offences, remitting their fines and costs, and quashing all pending prosecutions.

Meanwhile the ordinary course of private affairs in the city began to be resumed. On Saturday the clerks of the Post Office had returned to their duty, and letters were again received and delivered as usual. Some embarrassments arose in regard to commercial engagements, the discharge of which had been of necessity prevented or suspended during the late political commotions. The Municipal Commission resolved to remedy the difficulty by granting an extension of ten days on all acceptances payable in Paris and falling due between the 26th of July and the 15th of August. In accordance with this regulation, the Tribunal of Commerce issued a decree ratifying the extension of payments, assigning for reason, that all commercial transactions having been

forcibly suspended and communications interrupted, the regular payment of bills during that period had been rendered wholly impracticable. On Saturday, also, the Bank of France was opened, and most of the private bankers resumed the transaction of business in the ordinary way. The barriers, moreover, were thrown open this day, so as to allow the diligences to proceed as they had done before the Revolution.

It is not to be inferred from this that Paris exhibited a peaceful aspect, during these the few days immediately succeeding the contest. Apprehension of possible surprise prevented the removal of the barricades, so that an invading foe would have found the streets unpaved, the houses embattled, and obstructions of every conceivable kind thrown up in the great thoroughfares. As a measure of salubrity, the inhabitants made gutters in the streets, to carry off the stagnant water without endangering the barricades. The principal avenues were continually crowded with persons going about from curiosity, or with assemblages of armed men of every variety of dress, equipments, and weapons. During the evening the absence of the street-lamps was supplied by lights in the windows. Sentinels were of course stationed at all the important points, consisting partly of the soldiers of the National Guard, and partly of the ordinary armed citizens, whose only title of service was their participation in the victory of the Barricades. The Palace of the Tuileries was purposely left in charge of the brave men, who had driven the Royal Guards before them on Thursday, and gained possession of its halls at the point of the bayonet; so that rough clad and irregularly armed citizens took the place of the trim sentinels, who formerly guarded its precincts. Amid these indications of pending insurrection,

with all the populace of Paris and its environs thronging the streets, and the poorest artizans in arms for the cause of freedom, the most absolute respect for private property was exhibited, notwithstanding the abundant opportunities of license, which naturally offer themselves at such a period.

The government lost no time in providing a regular military force, for the protection of the public liberties against whatever aggression. — Twenty regiments of the National Guard were organized without delay, the lists being filled up with a rapidity, which assured the minds of the most timid, that defenders would not be wanting to sustain the government, either against popular outrage or the efforts of the dethroned family and their partisans. In fact, soldiers of all description came in continually to join the popular ranks, many of them veterans of the old army, who were treated with peculiar respect on all hands. An occasion speedily occured, as we shall presently see, for testing the spirit and resolution of the citizens.

Our narrative of the events of the Revolution has been confined thus far to Paris. There in fact the contest, in a military point of view, began and ended. But it is to be understood that identically the same feeling existed in the Departments, where the receipt of the Ordinances was followed by a simultaneous rising of the inhabitants, and the organization of insurrection just as in Paris. In some of the great cities, especially Rouen and Nantes, the popular enthusiasm broke out into open resistance, before it was known what steps would be taken at the metropolis. It was the same at Lyons. The large towns around Paris, if they did not anticipate the movement in that city, were not backward in following it up.

It was not Paris, which produced the Revolution. The whole Nation was animated with but one sentiment, which produced a unanimity of action, as decided and marked as if it had been the result of concert, although it is perfectly certain that the publication of the Ordinances was wholly unexpected, and therefore could not have been prepared for in such a way as to produce the universal movement of resistance, which actually took place.

Troops had been ordered to Paris from the camp at Saint Omer. They advanced as far as Poix, a village two or three days march from Paris, where they halted, and on receiving orders to that effect from General Gérard in the name of the provisional government, they marched back to Saint Omer under new colors, the soldiers having of their own motion procured tricolored cockades from Paris by the diligences. A division stationed at Versailles under General Bordesoulle, had commenced its march for Paris in support of Marshal Marmont, but turned back on learning the evacuation of Paris, intending to return to its old quarters. Meanwhile the National Guard of Versailles had got under arms, and threatened to exclude the troops; but, after some negociation between the two parties, they came to an amicable understanding, and the soldiers entered Versailles amid cries of *Vive la Charte!* In truth, the events of Thursday had limited the Kingdom of Charles Tenth to the Château of Saint Cloud, and the great avenues around it, which the defeated soldiers of the Guard continued to occupy.

When the Duc de Raguse retired to Saint Cloud, nothing could exceed the consternation which his appearance there, followed by the flying troops, produced on the royal conspirators assembled at the Château. Such was the excess of their infatuation, that they had not dreamed of the

possibility of so untoward an event, and the intelligence of defeat and rout came upon them with the stunning suddenness of a clap of thunder. On the morning of Thursday, the Duc de Mortemart, who, as Captain in the Gardes-du-Corps, hastened from his château to Saint Cloud on hearing of the disturbances in Paris, and who knew from personal experience how perilous was the crisis, had an interview with the King, in which the Duke frankly stated his apprehensions. The King laughed at his fears, as the panic of a young man, born and brought up amid the agitations of the Revolution. As for me, said Charles, I have not forgotten how things went forty years ago: I will not, like my brother, mount a hurdle, — I choose to mount on horseback.* The King was not aroused from his infatuation of confidence, until the arrival of M. de Sémonville in the afternoon, so speedily followed by Marmont's retreating forces. The weak minded Dauphin was roused into a sort of phrensy, on seeing the Duc de Raguse. Breaking out in the most insulting language towards Marmont, the Dauphin ordered him under arrest, and seizing on his sword, endeavored to break it across the pummel of his saddle so precipitately as to cut himself in the act of doing it. Soon afterwards tidings came back from Paris that the offer of accommodation, borne by M. de Mortemart, was too late, and that Charles had nothing to expect from the voluntary act of his late subjects. To be restored to power, he must continue the appeal to arms. But it was conclusively shown by the declaration and conduct of the troops, that they had no disposition to protract the struggle. They were fatigued with their exertions, and disheartened by want of food

*Mazas, Mémoires, p. 51.

and other necessaries, and by the conviction that they were on the wrong side. We may imagine, better than we can describe, the agony of disappointment, chagrin, and self-reproach, which at this hour must have borne down the royal family, and such of the partisans of *coups d'état* as still clung to the fallen monarch.

Notwithstanding the desperate state of things at Saint Cloud, an effort was made on Friday to place the Château in a state of defence. Battalions of the Guard were posted along the roads leading to Saint Cloud from Paris and Versailles. Addresses to the soldiers from the revolutionary government were largely circulated, inviting them to abandon the King. These overtures were favorably received by the troops of the Line, a whole regiment of which piled their arms, and marched off to Paris; — but a principle of honor kept the Guards together, conscious as they were of the hopelessness of the royal cause, and subjected to many privations, which the King wanted disposition or power to relieve. Indeed, Charles, instead of having the means of molesting the Parisians, now began to be seriously alarmed for his own safety, as reports reached him that the victorious *bourgeois* began to prepare for attacking him at Saint Cloud. At three o'clock on the morning of Saturday, the royal family, with the Ministers and other persons who remained attached to the Court, left Saint Cloud in the midst of the household troops, who resolved to protect the King against the citizens, determining at the same time not to engage in any hostilities of their own accord.

The King halted at Versailles, taking up his quarters in the Trianon, a small royal residence in the Park of Versailles, where the royal family and the Ministers met for the last time. From

Versailles he continued onward to Rambouillet, a village ten leagues from Paris, where there is a hunting château belonging to the crown. Here a camp was formed with the ostensible purpose of making a stand. But, on Sunday, the 1st of August, information was brought to the Court of the proceedings of the day before in regard to the Duc d'Orléans; and the next day Charles and the Dauphin addressed a communication to the Lieutenant General, renouncing their rights in favor of the Duc de Bordeaux, and charging the Duc d'Orléans to cause the accession of Henry V to be proclaimed. Meanwhile the jewels of the crown had been withdrawn from their place of deposit in Paris early in the last week, and were now under the control of Charles. To the act of abdication no answer was given but to despatch a Commission formed of Marshal Maison, M. de Schonen, and M. Odillon Barrot, to demand the regalia and require the royal family to hasten their departure from the Kingdom. The King refused to see the Commission, and instead of disposing himself to comply with their injunctions, caused the Guards to be sounded as to their willingness to retire to La Vendée and repeat the struggle of the former Revolution. But neither the officers nor the soldiers would listen to any such scheme. The day of uncalculating frantic royalism had long since passed away. The Guards were Frenchmen in spirit as in fact; and selected, as they had been, for their fidelity to the House of Bourbon, still they were too wise, and too fond of their country, to engage to embark in a desperate and unavailing contention in behalf of a prostrate dynasty, who had proved themselves incapable of reigning, and whose fatal incompetency was alike ruinous to their friends and themselves. Instead of manifesting any readiness to sustain a civil war, the

Guards resolved, in the words of M. Bermond, only 'to place themselves between the royal family and any portion of their subjects who might be excited to attack them, pending the negotiations which were to decide the fate of France.'

The Commission lost no time in reporting to the government at Paris, that Charles refused to accept of their safe conduct for his retirement from the country, insisting that he had abdicated only in favor of the Duc de Bordeaux, and that he should remain at Rambouillet, and defend himself there, until he received a satisfactory answer from the Lieutenant General. The announcement of this resolution brought matters to a crisis at once. It was impossible to suffer an armed force, which withheld obedience from the new government, to remain within a day's march of the capital; and equally impossible to restrain the public irritation, excited by the obstinacy of the King. There was imminent danger that the inflamed populace would, of their own accord, rise in a mass and proceed to attack the royal camp and family; in which case, if left to themselves, they might commit some deplorable excess, which would dishonor the cause of the Revolution.

The citizens were already ringing the tocsin, and arming themselves without waiting for orders. To prevent the possible consequences, the government took measures to arrange an expedition under the command of responsible officers, who might control, as well as direct, the popular movements. The National Guard were summoned to their posts, and it was announced to them that the ground assumed by the King required that he should be compelled to surrender, and that to effect this object the government called on the citizens to enlist for an attack on the camp at Rambouillet. The announcement was received with

the greatest enthusiasm. Thousands volunteered in the course of a few hours, and were despatched in omnibuses, hackney coaches, cabriolets, diligences, *coucous*, carts, — in short, in every species of carriages which Paris afforded. In addition to six thousand troops of the National Guard, were thousands of the half armed but excited men of the Barricades, who poured out of Paris in a tumultuary force, and if they had come in conflict with the royal family would have been as dangerous and as ungovernable as the militant mobs of October, 1789. The command of the expedition was given to General Pajol, having under him General Excelmans, Colonel Jacqueminot, and M. Georges La Fayette.

Meanwhile the Comissioners hurried on to Rambouillet once more, in advance of the army, for the purpose of making a last effort to persuade the King to listen to reason. They represented to him the extreme hazard *he* would run by an encounter with the mighty host of unscrupulous men, who were on the way to Rambouillet. As had all along happened with Charles, he yielded to selfish considerations of personal safety, where he had been regardless of the blood of his people, and consented to dismiss all intention of resistance and accept the safe conduct of the Commissioners. Indeed such was the consternation of the King, that his Court broke up in great confusion at ten o'clock in the evening of August 3d, and set off without waiting for the appearance of his good friends of the faubourgs of Paris. The armed citizens had ere this arrived at a village in the neighborhood of Rambouillet, where they bivouacked for the night. On learning the departure of the King the next morning, they seized on the coaches belonging to the Court, and whatever other vehicles they could find, and returned to

Paris on the 4th, forming a vast procession of soldiers and citizens, who entered the city shouting the Marseilles Hymn, and firing their guns into the air in triumph.

The King had selected Great Britain as a place of refuge. It was arranged between him and the Commissioners that he should restore the crown-jewels, and be furnished with the sum of four millions of francs in money for his private use. He desired to quit France by the way of Cherbourg, and thither accordingly the Commissioners directed their course. At Dreux, where they halted after leaving Rambouillet, the King dismissed all the troops except the body-guard, which continued with him as far as Cherbourg. The Ministers, aware of the danger they had incurred of being brought to trial for their crimes, had fled secretly and in disguise, in different directions, before the King submitted. The royal family passed along slowly through Normandy, deserted by the perfidious counsellors and courtiers, who had contributed, by their advice, to the destitution and humiliation, which now pressed upon the last of the Bourbons. They were protected from public insult and injury less by the feeble guard which surrounded them, than by the tri-colored scarfs of the Commissioners, and the universal sympathy entertained for fallen greatness: — for everywhere they found the national flag flying on the towers, and the inhabitants in arms for the Charter.

The exiles embarked at Cherbourg with their suite in two American ships, engaged at Havre for that purpose, and landed in England the 17th of August. They were received there with but little show of respect; for how indeed could any respect be felt for Charles or Louis Antoine? The compassionate hospitality due to their rank and their situation was of course extended towards

them, and nothing more. The King repaired to Lulworth in Dorsetshire, the seat of an ancient English Catholic family, where he remained until the old apartments at Holyrood House, in Edinburgh, which he had occupied previous to the Restoration, were again prepared for his reception. In that ancient palace, — a retreat of congenial recollections for the relics of a royal House, which had rivalled the Stuarts in the infatuation of its folly, — Charles and his son had leisure for the life of peace and seclusion, which alone became their present condition.

In thus tracing the responsible members of this unhappy family from power to privacy, from the splendors of the Tuileries and Saint Cloud to the humble retirement of Holyrood, we should not forget those companions of their exile, who had participated in a tenfold degree in the calamities and sorrows of their House, whilst wholly free of its guilt, — namely, the daughter of Marie Antoinette, and the widow of the Duc de Berri, who suffered because others had sinned. The language of condemnation and reproach, thus far so frequently applied to the members of the royal family, belongs not to them for any thing which had transpired at this period. Neither the King nor the Dauphin is deserving of much pity, and they are entitled to no respect. The Duchesse d'Angoulême has a claim to both respect and pity; and so also had the Duchesse de Berri, and would have continued to have, unless she had forfeited it by a succession of indiscreet attempts in favor of her son.

The Comte d'Artois was bred in the profligate Court of Louis XV, and passed a youth of dissipation and idleness, until the Revolution came to arrest his disorderly career, and teach him that princes were amenable to the tribunal of public

opinion and public justice. He emigrated at an early period, and hovered about the frontiers of France, joining in the poor schemes of invasion planned by his family circle, until the success of Bonaparte drove them from the Continent to seek an asylum in England. At the age of sixty-eight he succeeded Louis XVIII, whose dying advice to his successor was to '*govern legally*.' For a time Charles X seemed disposed to abide by the death-bed injunction of his brother, and to govern in the sense of the Charter. But he was weak, vain, headstrong, unable to appreciate the exigencies of his position, — and fell into the hands of unworthy counsellors, who had never forgiven the Revolution, and longed for the return of absolutism.

Had the Dauphin possessed the energy of character demanded by his relation to the country and the situation of his family, he might have retarded the fall of the Bourbons; but unfortunately for them all, however good a hunter, he was a weak man and an incapable ruler. Louis XVIII sought to acquire for him some of that military renown, which the French so much admire in their princes, by giving him the nominal command of the Spanish expedition. The inglorious events of this war against the Cortes have been sculptured on the arch of the Carrousel, in place of the great victories of the year 1805, which the Allies removed when they occupied Paris. But the title of Duque del Trocadéro is all that the Dauphin can fairly claim as his own share of the honors of the campaign, and he has since reposed on his laurels, — until he wounded himself in the very brave and highly meritorious act of disarming Marshal Marmont on the last of the Three Days. He appears to have entered madly into the mad projects of Polignac, and divides with his father the loss and the shame of unsuccessful usurpation.

Not so the Duchesse d'Angoulême, whom Napoleon, with his accustomed discrimination, has termed the only man among the Bourbons. The daughter of a long line of kings, she has seen her father and mother perish on the scaffold, her brother clandestinely done to death by ignoble hands and ignoble means, her husband's brother assassinated in the streets, her family pensioned exiles and outcasts, and now a third time driven from the throne of France with ignominy. With her poor woman's wit, of which her uncle and husband seem to have thought so meanly, Cassandra like, she foresaw the effect of the infatuated measures they had in train, but vainly uttered her oracles of warning and menace to deter them from rushing upon destruction. With a frame macerated by religious severities, and views fixed upon a happier future, it is for her family more than for herself, that she laments the reverses, which have befallen her House.

The Duchesse de Berri possessed a temper naturally gay, light, and amiable, designed, in short, for enjoyment and popularity, — and which, notwithstanding the untimely death of her husband, and the change of her prospects which that event occasioned, would have assured her the possession of comparative happiness as mother of the young heir to France. Her hopes were dashed to the ground, by a series of desperate measures, against which she, as well as the Dauphiness, protested. Being a daughter of the late King of the Two Sicilies, of whom the present Queen of France is a sister, she was doomed to see her aunt occupy the throne, which in better times she looked forward to as probably to become one day her own. She also was rendered an exile by no fault of hers; and considering the advanced age of Charles and the Dauphin, their misfortune affected her and

her son more seriously than it did the older members of the family. That son, the last remaining scion of his race, — for the posterity of Philip V are aliens to France by the most sacred oaths and treaties, — left the land of his fathers to become the centre and watchword of political intrigues, and to renew in his own person, perhaps, the romantic fortunes of Charles Edward of England.

CHAPTER VI.

Proceedings of the Chambers.—The new Charter.—Duc d'Orléans King.—Settlement of the Government—Impeachment of the Ex-Ministers.—Riots.—Trial of the Ex-Ministers.—Remarks.

We arrive, at length, at the catastrophe of the Revolution, at the fifth act of the political drama, which opened with the appointment of M. de Polignac to office for the purpose of overthrowing the Charter, and terminates with the elevation of the Duc d'Orleans to the throne. This was a result for which all Paris was now prepared, and less doubt was entertained as to the result itself, than as to the best means of reaching it. The Republicans continued to dispute the authority of the Chambers to reorganize the institutions, which the victory of the Three Days had laid prostrate. They maintained that the Charter had entirely lost its vitality; that the Chamber of Deputies elected under it, ceased on the 30th of July to be a constitutional element of the State; that of course it had no right to proceed in the performance of ordinary business, and still less any right

to remodel the Charter itself; and that, when it assembled, it should do nothing more than simply to provide convenient and regular means of ascertaining the will of the people on the great question, which now came up for decision. Whatever objections had existed to the substitution of a Lieutenant General in place of the provisional Commission of Government, applied with added authority to finally and permanently settling the public affairs through the agency of the Chambers alone. Particular difficulties presented themselve in great force. How could the Chamber of Deputies dispose of the Chamber of Peers, the existence of which the public voice declared to be contrary to the wishes of regenerated France? It seemed to the numerous party, who maintained these opinions, a fit occasion for proclaiming a return to the true republican principle, the sovereignty of the people, and the establishment of a government by their immediate intervention.

This end might be accomplished by an act of the Chamber reviving the Constitution of 1813, which they contended was preferable to the Charter of Louis XVIII; and in that case the question whether the Duc d'Orléans should be Emperor could be submitted to the suffrages of the nation. Or the Chamber might provide for the convocation of a Constituent Assembly, a Convention of the whole Kingdom, for the purpose of enacting a new fundamental law in place of the Charter. But the considerations hinted at in the last chapter, which induced the liberal party to accede to the bestowment of power on the Duc d'Orléans, prevailed on the majority of those men of influence, who possessed the means of directing public affairs, to determine that the present Chamber should proceed to the complete settlement of the government upon a stable basis. The same con-

siderations led the Chamber, when it had once resolved upon settling the government, to proceed with a degree of celerity, which left no room for the operation of adverse schemes, and hardly afforded time for due reflection and deliberation on the part of the Deputies themselves. In doing so, they avoided, perhaps, present disorders, but sowed the seeds of future contentions at least, if not revolutions.

The opening of the Chambers was celebrated at the stated time and in the usual place, with all the forms of a royal sitting, so far as they were applicable to the new state of things. It was justly regarded by all parties as a crisis of peculiar difficulty and importance. About half the Deputies elect assembled, including some few members of the Right, who, knowing that their persons were perfectly safe, had independence and patriotism enough to take part in the deliberations of the Chamber. A portion of the Peers also attended. In obedience to the republican spirit of the times, the Deputies appeared in the ordinary dress of citizens, instead of the official costume, which they had been accustomed to wear before the Three Days. In consequence, also, of a positive regulation, the Peers and Deputies were treated with equal respect.

The Duc d'Orléans, as Lieutenant General of the Kingdom, opened the sitting with a speech fully in accordance with the principles of the Revolution. It was a plain, direct, manly address, worthy of the speaker and the occasion. He spoke of the struggle of the Three Days, of the heroism of the people of Paris, of the consequent dissolution of the pre-existent social system, and of the necessities of public order, which had placed him in authority. He alluded to the misfortunes of the royal family with delicacy and propriety. While

holding up to the rest of Europe a desire of peace equally with liberty, as the animating spirit of France, he gave assurance that respect for the rights of all, and consequent public stability, would enable the new government to maintain itself unharmed under all the hazards of a forcible change of dynasty. That portion of it, which spoke of his own personal views and feelings, was peculiarly judicious and satisfactory. 'I hastened,' he says, 'to the midst of this valiant people, followed by my family, and wearing those colors, which for the second time have marked among us the triumph of liberty. I have come, firmly resolved to devote myself to all that circumstances should require of me in the situation wherein they have placed me, to establish the empire of the laws, to save liberty which was threatened, and to render impossible the return of evils so great, by securing forever the power of the Charter, whose name, invoked during the combat, was also appealed to after the victory. In the accomplishment of this noble task it is for the Chambers to guide me. All rights must be solemnly guarantied, all the institutions necessary to their full and free exercise must receive the developement of which they have need. *Attached by inclination and conviction to the principles of a free government, I accept beforehand all the consequences of it.*' These professions of cordial participation in the feelings of the people, whether wholly sincere or not, were such as the occasion demanded, and served to augment the popularity of the Lieutenant General.

He concluded by announcing the abdication of Charles and the renunciation of the Dauphin, which he had received late the night before from Rambouillet. He did not state that any reservative had been made in favor of the Duc de Bordeaux; nor was it necessary; for the abdication

itself was a mere deference to necessity, which the condition annexed to it neither strengthened nor diminished. Indeed it would have been quite as consonant to the wishes of the victorious party, if they had been left to declare the throne forfeited for high crimes, without being anticipated in regard to it by the King.

Nothing was done at this sitting ; but the next day the Chambers met, and M. Labbey de Pompières having taken the chair as senior member, they proceeded to verify the credentials of the several Deputies present, and as usual chose five persons to be presented to the Lieutenant General, out of whom he, as successor to the rights of the King, should select for them a President. They were MM. Casimir Périer, Jacques Lafitte, Benjamin Delessert, Dupin, and Royer Collard; and the selection fell upon M. Casimir Périer. Baron Pasquier was appointed President of the Chamber of Peers. Other business of form occupied the Chambers until the fourth day of the session, August 6th, when the important proceedings for amending the Charter and transferring the crown were commenced, and continued during the succeeding day, on which these changes were finally completed, and the Duc d'Orléans became King of the French.

The proposition for these modifications of the government was made by M. Bérard, a Deputy very generally respected, who had efficiently forwarded the recent movements. It consisted of a series of Resolutions, first, declaring the throne of France vacant by reason of the events of July; secondly, proposing certain suppressions, alterations, and additions in the text of the Charter; thirdly, stipulating that certain laws shall be enacted with the least possible delay; and lastly, setting forth that on condition of his accepting these con-

ditions and propositions, 'the Chamber of Deputies declares that the universal and urgent interest of the French Nation calls to the throne His Royal Highness Louis Philippe d'Orléans, Duc d'Orléans, Lieutenant General of the Kingdom, and his descendants forever in the male line by order of primogeniture, with the perpetual exclusion of females and their descendants,' by the title of King of the French. As, next to the change of dynasty, these conditions and propositions, or guaranties as they are often called, comprise the constitutional advantages secured by the Revolution, they will justify a particular examination.

The discussion of the Resolutions was perfectly free, insomuch that several royalist Deputies very firmly and fully expressed their attachment to the family of Charles X, although none of them went so far as to defend the Ordinances, and several of them spoke with sorrow and indignation of the pernicious counsels, by which the King had been misled. Nothing is more singular, however, in the proceedings of these two days, than the extreme brevity of the debates, the absence of any elaborate speeches for effect, and the business-like manner in which the proposed measures were discussed and settled. MM. Bérard, Villemain, Dupin, Eusébe Salverte, Mauguin, La Fayette, Hyde de Neuville, de Martignac, and de Conny were the prominent speakers in the debate, in which also MM. Benjamin Constant, Alexandre de Laborde, Demarçay, Augustin Périer, and de Brigode, among others, took more or less part. In regard to the form of the debate, it need only be said that, except some conversation as to an address in reply to the speech of the Lieutenant General, which ended in a decision that the proposition of M. Bérard should take the place of an address, — excepting this,

the debate turned upon the merits of the questions presented in the several Resolutions.

The speech of M. Bérard, which introduced the whole subject to the consideration of the Chamber, was the only general statement of the views of the Orléans party; and for that reason more than for its intrinsic merits, it is inserted in this place. M. Bérard said:

'A solemn compact united the French People with their Monarch. This compact has been broken; and the violator of it has no title now to insist on its execution. Charles X and his son in vain pretend to transmit a power, which they no longer possess. Their power is extinguished in the blood of thousands of victims. The act of abdication, which has been laid before you, is only a fresh instance of perfidy. The appearance of legality which it wears is a mere deception. It is a brand of discord thrown among us.

'The real enemies of our country, those who by flattering it urged the fallen government on to ruin, are busy on all sides; they assume all colors, they proclaim all opinions. If a vague desire of liberty seizes on some generous minds, our enemies hasten to take advantage of a sentiment, which they are incapable of understanding; and ultra-royalists present themselves in the guise of rigid republicans. Others affect a hypocritical attachment for the forgotten son of the conqueror of Europe, which would change into hate, if there could be any serious question of making him Chief of France.

'The instability, inseparable from the existing forms of government, encourages the promoters of discord. Let us disarm them by putting an end to it. A supreme law, that of necessity, has placed weapons in the hands of the Parisians, to repel oppression. This law has caused us to adopt as a provisionary Chief, and as the only means of safety, a prince, who is the sincere friend of constitutional institutions. The same law would lead us to adopt, without delay, a definite head for the State.

'But whatever confidence this prince inspires, the rights which we are called upon to defend, oblige us to establish the conditions, under which he shall receive his power. Odiously deceived on several occasions, it will be permitted us to stipulate the strictest guaranties. Our institutions are incomplete, vitiated even in certain points of view; it is necessary to extend and reform them. The prince, who is at our head, is already aware of our just wants. The principles of several fundamental laws have been recognised by him al-

ready; and other principles, other laws, are not less indispensable, and will also be secured.

'We are the elected delegates of the people. They have confided to us the defence of their rights, the expression of their wants. Their first wants, their dearest interests, are liberty and repose. They have conquered their liberty; it is for us to secure their repose; and we cannot, except by giving them a stable and just Government. It is idle to pretend that in doing so we exceed our powers. I could refute this objection, if there was sufficient occasion, by invoking the law to which I have already referred, that of imperious, invincible necessity.

'In this state of things, taking into consideration the grave and pressing situation in which the country is placed, the indispensable necessity of changing this precarious posture for a safer one, and the universal wish manifested by France to obtain the completion of her institutions, I have the honor to propose the following Resolutions.'

There can be no doubt that the Resolutions had been fully concerted and arranged out of the Chamber, before they were proposed in it. If this did not appear from the nature of the propositions themselves, it would from the slight discussion and alteration they received in passing through the Chamber to become the fundamental law of the land. Indeed there is little to be selected from the debates of these two days, which accords with the all important nature of the subjects in agitation. Except a feeling protestation on the part of M. de Martignac, against the application of the word *ferocity* to the conduct of Charles, the most remarkable speeches in opposition to the Resolutions were those of M. de Conny and of M. Hyde de Neuville. M. de Conny argued at some length the claims of the Duc de Bordeaux in the following manner:

'In the terrible circumstances in which we are placed, freedom of debate is more than ever a sacred law. I come forward at the voice of my conscience; silence would be cowardice. Social order is shaken to its foundations. These tumultuous commotions, which suddenly suspend the action of the legitimate powers instituted to maintain order in so-

ciety, are epochs of calamity, which exercise the most fatal influence upon the destiny of nations. Inexorable history, rising above cotemporary passions, will impress upon these lamentable days the character which belongs to them, and the cry of human conscience is raised to consecrate this eternal truth, that *force constitutes no right.*

'In these times of trouble, liberty is invoked, but the expression of thought has ceased to be free. Liberty is stifled by the sanguinary cries, which carry alarm in every direction. Suffer not yourselves to be subjugated by the cries which resound about you. Statesmen, remain calm in the midst of perils, and when confused voices call to France the son of Napoleon, invoke the Republic, and proclaim the Duc d'Orléans, — unshaken in your duties, remember your oaths, and acknowledge the sacred rights of the royal infant, whom, after so many misfortunes, Providence has given to France. Think of the judgment of posterity: — it would be terrible. You would not wish that history should say you were faithless to your oaths. The eyes of Europe are upon us. We have too long exhibited a spectacle of strange instability; too long we have changed sides, as often as victory has changed colors. Brought back to truth by misfortune, let us remain calm in the midst of so many turbulent passions, and let us bestow our respect and tears upon great and royal disasters.

'By continuing faithful to our duties, I wish to spare our country all the calamities and crimes consequent on usurpations. Viewing with an anxious mind the destiny of France, I perceive the twofold scourge of civil and foreign war threatening our noble country, I perceive liberty disappearing forever, I perceive French blood flowing, and this blood would recoil upon our heads. Deference to the principle of legitimacy, that principle established by the Charter, can alone preserve our country from this fearful destiny. All France is bound by oaths. The army, ever faithful, will bend their arms before the young King. I call to witness our national honor. Let us not exhibit to the world the scandal of perjury. In the presence of the sacred rights of the Duc de Bordeaux, the act which should raise the Duc d'Orléans to the throne, would be a violation of all human laws.

'As a Deputy, remembering my oaths before God, who will judge us, I have truly spoken my belief. I should have forfeited the esteem of my adversaries, if, in the perils which surround us, I had remained silent. I declare the sentiments which animate me in the face of heaven: I would express them at the cannon's mouth. If the principle of legitimacy be not recognised by the Charter, I must say that

I see not what right I have to participate in these deliberations.'

After M. Benjamin Constant had made some remarks in reply to M. de Conny, in the course of which he remarked that legitimacy, in its ordinary sense, could no longer be invoked; and that the only legitimacy which France now admitted, was derived from the people and the laws, — M. Hyde de Neuville said: —

'I judge no man. In politics, as in religion, all consciences are not subject to the same influences. Men seeking what is good may follow different paths. Each of us obeys his own conscience, mine is my only guide. If you do not partake of my sentiments, you will not refuse me your esteem. I have done everything which a Frenchman could do, to prevent the calamities, which we have experienced. I have been faithful to my oaths. I did not betray that family, which false friends have precipitated into an abyss. I should contradict my life, and dishonor myself by changing my sentiments, were I to assent to these Resolutions. With my hand upon my heart, I cannot but reject the dangerous sovereignty, which the committee proposes to establish. The measure which you contemplate, is of the deepest import, and ought to be weighed and examined with more of deliberation, than it seems about to receive. It is dangerous to rest the future destinies of a great People upon the impressions of a moment. But I have not received from heaven the power to arrest the thunderbolt. To the acts, which it is proposed to consummate, I can but oppose my wishes, in offering up the sincerest prayers for the repose and liberty of my country.'

Nothing, however, which could be said by the friends of the fallen dynasty, was capable of having any influence on such an occasion, and only served the purpose of a personal protest on the part of the speaker. But the peculiar position of La Fayette, as the professor of republican opinions and the most trusted individual of the Republican party, gave more than ordinary moment to the short speech in which he expressed his assent to the Resolutions. It was substantially as follows:

'On ascending this tribune to pronounce an opinion contested by many friends of liberty, I do not yield to any enthusiasm of the moment, nor am I seeking a popularity, which I shall never prefer to the discharge of my duties. The republican sentiments which I have manifested in all times, and before all powers, are well known; but these sentiments do not prevent my being the defender of a constitutional throne, raised by the will of the Nation.

'The same sentiments animate me at the present crisis, when it has been judged fitting to elevate to the constitutional throne the Prince Lieutenant General. And I am bound to avow that the choice coincides with my own desires the more, in proportion as I know him better.

'But I shall differ from many of my fellow citizens on the question of hereditary peerage. I have always thought it necessary that legislative bodies should be divided into two Chambers differently constituted; but never that it was useful to have hereditary legislators and judges. Aristocracy is a bad ingredient to be introduced into popular institutions. It is, therefore, with great satisfaction that I find you engaged in a measure conformable to sentiments which I have all my life declared, and which I can now only repeat.

'While my conscience forces me to reiterate this opinion, my fellow citizens will do me the justice to acknowledge that, if I have always been the supporter of liberty, I have never ceased to be the supporter of public order.'

An earnest attempt was made by M. Mauguin to provide for a purification of the magistracy by some article in the conditions of the contemplated sovereignty, but without success. Men, who felt no hesitation about changing the dynasty and decimating or abolishing the Chamber of Peers, were affected by some unaccountable scruples as to the violation of rights nowise more sacred than those of the peerage and the royal family. In fact, very few material alterations were made in the Resolutions, as reported by the Commission to which they were referred; and of these the most curious was on motion of M. Dupin, in the following words: 'France resumes her colors. For the future no cockade shall be worn but the tricolored.' This amendment was adopted by ac-

clamation. It seems at first sight an exceedingly frivolous and rather puerile matter to occupy the attention of the Chamber at such a time, and to be made an article of the new constitutional law. But we may suppose it was intended as a propitiatory offering to the popular sentiment, being equivalent to a pledge that the purposes, doctrines, and principles of the first Revolution were adopted as the inheritance of the second.

On Saturday, August 7th, the Resolutions as amended were adopted in the Chamber of Deputies by a vote of 219 to 33, the affirmative votes being just four more than one half the entire legal number of Deputies. The question was taken at five o'clock in the afternoon, and the Deputies immediately went on foot in procession to the Palais Royal, escorted by the National Guards, to offer their Bill of Rights and the Crown to the Duc d'Orléans. M. Lafitte, as President of the Chamber, read aloud the conditions on which the Sovereignty was proffered to him, and he accepted it on those conditions, pledging himself solemnly to the performance of the engagements imposed. Everything passed with the utmost apparent cordiality and sincerity on both sides.

Meanwhile the Chamber of Peers, which had been very little considered in these proceedings, assembled at nine o'clock in the evening, after the the proffer of the crown to the Duc d'Orléans and acceptance of it by him, to discuss and act upon the Resolutions which had been sent up from the Deputies. An elaborate speech was made by M. de Châteaubriand, which seems to have comprised nearly all the discussion of the meeting, warmly maintaining the pretensions of the Duc de Bordeaux. The Peers professed a feeling of delicacy in regard to an article of the Resolutions, which *unpeered* a portion of their House, and abstained

from acting upon that, but adopted all the rest of the articles, by a vote of eighty to ten, and at half past ten o'clock repaired to the Palais Royal in imitation of the Deputies, to signify their assent to the new constitutional act, — thus completing the formal transfer of the crown.

The Declaration of Rights thus sanctioned by the future King, comprises amendments of the Charter of Louis XVIII, partly in respect of articles that were of a temporary nature, and partly in respect of general principles. In effect, it leaves the substance of the Charter as it stood, only making alterations in some of its provisions. The Deputies suppressed the preamble of the Charter of Louis XVIII, as recognising the principle of *octroi* or royal grant, and as therefore inconsistent with the theory of national sovereignty, which ought to be the basis of a constitutional Charter. In place of this preamble a new one was substituted, which declared the throne to be vacant in fact and by right. The several changes in the body of the Charter concerned,

1. *The public Law of the French*, as it is termed, being that part of the Charter, which in our constitutions is called the Declaration of Rights. The old Charter, while it secured the maintenance and protection of all denominations of Christianity, entitled the Catholic the religion of the State: the new one makes no such distinction in favor of the Catholic Church, simply designating it as the religion professed by the majority of the French. It also assures the freedom of the press by providing that the censorship shall never be re-established. These two changes are of course decidedly in favor of liberty, the second evidently so and the first not less so, as it places the Catholic and Protestant persuasions on a level. — That is untrue, however, which some of the books

on the Revolution assert, namely, that every system of faith, whether Christian or not, now stands on the same footing in France. The ministers of the Catholic 'and other Christian confessions' are by the Charter to receive pay from the public treasury, and of course the Christian religion, without distinction of sect, is the religion of the State.

2. *The King's Government.* The new Charter omits the words of the 14th article, which Polignac alleged as justifying the Ordinances, and expressly declares that the King shall never suspend the laws or dispense with their execution. It also takes away the exclusive right of the King to propose laws, and communicates the initiative to each of the Chambers in common with the King; thus materially abridging the royal authority.

3. *The Chambers.* The sittings of the Chamber of Peers, which previously had been private, are made public. Deputies are eligible at the age of thirty, instead of forty, as in the old Charter; and persons otherwise qualified become electors at the age of twenty-five instead of thirty; while the pecuniary qualification of both Deputies and electors, instead of being prescribed in the Charter, is left to be settled by a law. The Chamber elects its own President, instead of submitting a list of five candidates to the King. It is expressly provided that no tax can be established nor imposed, if it has not been consented to by the two Chambers and sanctioned by the King.

4. *Particular Rights.* Two new articles are introduced here, one of which seems to be a mere flourish of rhetoric, and the other unworthy the dignity of the instrument. The latter, which regulates the color of the cockade, has already been described. The former is in these words: 'The present Charter, and the rights it consecrates,

shall be entrusted to the patriotism and courage of the National Guard and all the citizens.' It is impossible to see any practical bearing which this article has, unless it is intended as an indirect mode of inserting a recognition of the National Guard. If so, why not do it plainly and directly?

5. *Special Provisions.* These consist of an article annulling all creations of Peers during the reign of Charles X, and providing that the whole subject of the peerage shall undergo revision. Whether hereditary peerage was consonant with the institutions and congenial to the spirit of the French, we do not stop now to inquire; but supposing that the institution itself was to stand, it is hard to see what justice or reason there was in disqualifying the ninety three Peers created by Charles X. Their creation was just as lawful as that of any of their fellows, being by a similar exercise of royal authority under the Charter. Every consideration of their personal devotedness to Charles, of the want of fairness in the circumstances of their exaltation, and of the injurious influence they might exert in the new order of things, applied with equal force to a great number of judicial functionaries, whom the Deputies left untouched. But in truth very little respect was paid in any part of these proceedings to the Peers, who seem to have been slighted purposely in many particulars, and who were certainly injured as a body by this individual act; for if the Deputies had power to degrade ninetythree of the Peers, they had power to abolish the whole Chamber.

The remaining article under this head, and the last we have to mention, consists of nine promise of laws, to be enacted with the shortest possible delay. These are the extension of the trial by jury to offences of the press, and to political offences; the responsibility of Ministers and the se-

condary agents of government; the reelection of Deputies appointed to public functions with salaries; the annual voting of the army estimates; the organization of the National Guards, with the intervention of the members in the choice of their officers; provisions to insure in a legal manner the state of officers of every grade by land and sea; departmental and municipal institutions founded upon an elective system; public instruction and the freedom of education; the abolition of the double vote, and the settling of the qualifications of electors and of eligibility.

All these modifications of the Charter augmented the popular liberties, but came so far short of the wishes of the more ardent of the victors of the Barricades, that great fear was entertained of some furious ebullition of public opposition to the proceedings of the Chambers. However, by the exertions of the leading republicans among the Deputies the effervescence was made to subside, and the whole went off without the commission of any violence. To prevent the recurrence of disorder, the settlement of the government was energetically hurried forward by the Deputies, arrangements being made for administering the oath of office to the new King on Monday next following the completion of the changes of the Charter. The Lieutenant General had greatly furthered his own popularity by the cordiality of his participation in all that was done for the security of the public liberties, and the friends of the new dynasty felt that it was desirable to sail on the tide of flood to the point at which they aimed.

The Baron Capelle, in a work which he has published on the Revolution, laments that the new King was neither anointed nor crowned, but simply installed, as they instal the presiding officer of a court of justice. It is truly lamentable that

the principles of civil liberty have made such small advances in Europe, that sensible men should consider the mummery and extravagance of the forms of royal coronation used by Charles X as alone suited to 'the advanced civilization of France.' The journals of the day dignified the ceremony with the name of enthronement; and the phrase is well enough; but whatever denomination it should bear, the act of *qualifying* the Duc d'Orléans was sufficiently solemn and impressive, and attended with quite as much of state as belongs to a revolutionary monarch. It took place in the hall of the Deputies in presence of all the parties to the late legislative acts. M. Casimir Périer read aloud the Declaration of the Chamber of Deputies, and presented it to the Lieutenant General, who then requested and received of Baron Pasquier the act of adhesion of the Peers. The Prince then rose and said:

'I have read with great attention the Declaration of the Chamber of Deputies and the act of adhesion of the Chamber of Peers. I have weighed and meditated all their expressions. I accept without restriction or reserve the conditions and engagements, which it contains, and the title of King of the French, which it confers upon me; and I am ready to swear to their observance.'

M. Dupont de l'Eure, acting Keeper of the Seals, delivered the words of oath to the King, who, according to the New England form of swearing practised in France, raised his hand, and pronounced the words of the oath as follows: —

'In the presence of God I swear faithfully to observe the constitutional Charter, with the modifications expressed in the Declaration of the Chamber of Deputies; to govern only by the laws and according to the laws; to cause exact and impartial justice to be done to every one according to his rights; and to act in all things with a sole view to the interest, the happiness, and the glory of the French People.'

The King then having subscribed the three doc-

uments, sat down and pronounced the following brief speech: —

'I have performed a great act. I deeply feel the weight of the duties which it imposes upon me; but my conscience tells me that I shall fulfil them; and it is with the full conviction of this that I have accepted the conditions proposed to me. I could have wished never to occupy the throne to which the national will has called me; but I yield to this will expressed by the Chambers in the name of the French People, for the maintenance of the Charter and the laws. The wise modifications, which we have made in the Charter, guaranty the security of the future; and France, I trust, will be happy at home and respected abroad; and the peace of Europe more and more confirmed.'

To render the ceremony more impressive the insignia of royalty were presented to the King by four Marshals of France. Marshal Macdonald presented the crown, Marshal Oudinot the sceptre, Marshal Mortier the sword, and Marshal Molitor the hand of justice.

M. Dupont de l'Eure concluded the proceedings by inviting the Deputies to meet the next day to take the oath of fidelity to the King and obedience to the constitutional Charter and the laws, and the assembly separated amid acclamations of applause, the Duc d'Orléans being now Louis Philippe, King of the French.

The first care of the King was, of course, to fix the organization of his Cabinet on a permanent basis. The Moniteur of August 12th announced that M. Dupont de l'Eure was appointed Keeper of the Seals; General Gérard, Minister of War; the Duc de Broglie, of Public Instruction; M. Guizot, of the Interior; Baron Louis, of Finance; Comte Molé, of Foreign Affairs; and Comte Sébastiani, of Marine. At the same time MM. Lafitte, Casimir Périer, Dupin, and Bignon became members of the cabinet without portfolios. These eminent individuals, most of whom have been fre-

quently before us in the foregoing pages, represented the moderate party among the enemies of the late dynasty; and the same reasons, which had seemed to exact the hasty proceeding of the Deputies in the transfer of the crown, namely, the danger of commotions in France and the necessity of conciliating the rest of Europe, — spoke loudly in favor of the formation of a cabinet of moderate views. And, in consideration of the particular preeminence acquired by those individuals in the affairs of France, it may not be amiss to give a cursory account of each of them, in this place.

M. Dupont de l'Eure, one of the great ornaments of the French judiciary, was a practising advocate at the bar of Normandy in 1789, and embarked with intrepidity and zeal in the cause of the Revolution. He held in succession the offices of mayor of his *commune*, administrator of the district of Louviers, public prosecutor, member of the Council of Five Hundred, President of the court of Rouen, with various other judicial and legislative stations, bestowed upon him previous to the Restoration, after which he became one of the most respected and influential members of the Chamber of Deputies on the side of the Opposition.

Comte Gérard is one of the eminent commanders of the Empire. He entered the armies of the Republic as a volunteer at the age of eighteen, and was constantly in service, from the battle of Fleurus, through so many glorious campaigns on the Rhine, in Italy, and in Germany; but it was in the series of bloody battles of 1812, and the following years, that he became preeminently distinguished. During the Hundred Days he was second only to Ney in the glory, and equal to him in the devotedness, of his efforts in behalf of France; and being elected a Deputy in 1822, he

earned new titles to public confidence as a powerful auxiliary of the Opposition.

The Duc de Broglie is of a family eminent for a succession of great military men in the reign of Louis XIV and Louis XV, but is himself distinguished only as a man of letters and a civilian, and as a zealous member of the liberal party ever since his first entrance into public life at the period of the Restoration.

M. Guizot has made his way to distinction as an author and a writer for the daily press, and is more universally esteemed for his talents and erudition, than for his consistency as a statesman. He first appeared in office at the Restoration, as secretary general of the Abbé Montesquieu, the then Minister of the Interior, and he followed Louis XVIII to Ghent during the Hundred Days. After the second Restoration, he held the office of secretary general in the department of Justice, and finally became a Counsellor of State under the ministry of M. Decazes, from whom he received the appoinment of the censorship of the press. M. Guizot went out of office with his patron the Duc Decazes, and while he returned with new ardor to his literary pursuits, he gradually became identified in his political course with the liberal party, although it was impossible to obliterate the recollection of his anti-national opinions and conduct during the early years of the Restoration. His lectures at the Sorbonne have imparted to him a European celebrity, especially the published ones on the History of Civilization in Europe and in France, which deserve to be better known, than they now are, in the United States.

M. Louis, a clerk to the parliament of Paris in 1789, adopted with his whole heart the principles of the Revolution. He was obliged to take refuge in England during the Reign of Terror, but

returned to France under the Consulate, and rose through various gradations of administrative duties to be Secretary in the department of Finance at the time of Napoleon's downfal. He has twice held the same office since the second Restoration, but at other times has generally acted with the Opposition in the Chamber of Deputies.

Count Molé began his career as a political writer, and rose rapidly under Napoleon through various lesser offices to be at length Minister of Justice. Since the Restoration he has also been high in office, having held at one time the portfolio of the Marine.

Comte Sébastiani is, like Napoleon, a native of Corsica, and served his countryman, alternately in the camp and in embassies, with equal fidelity, distinction, and honor. Being elected a Deputy in 1819, he displayed talents as a legislator not less remarkable than those which he had exhibited in diplomacy and war, — always, of course, in the ranks of Opposition.

M. Lafitte, at the epoch of the Revolution of the Three Days, was deemed the wealthiest banker in France, having risen by his own merits, from a clerkship in the house of the banker Perregaux, to be head of the commerce of Paris, and to hold eminent rank as an Opposition member of the Chamber of Deputies. We have seen the responsible part he took in the events of the Three Days; and to him, more than to any other individual, was then ascribed the management of the various measures by which the Duc d'Orléans was elevated to the throne.

M. Casimir Périer was also a banker by profession, and extensively engaged in various departments of productive industry, which did not prevent his entering deeply into political affairs. The important stations occupied by these two in-

viduals in the sequel will give us occasion to speak of them more particularly at a proper time.

M. Dupin, previous to the Three Days, had been chiefly distinguished as an advocate in lucrative practice at the bar of Paris, and gained the goodwill of the liberal party by the ability he displayed in the defence of persons accused of political offences, especially in the many trials, immediately consequent upon the second Restoration. Although attached, since 1819, to the service of the Duc d'Orleans, he manifested, it would seem, little readiness to participate in the more decided movements of the Three Days, and subjected himself to continual accusation of *incivism* and of lukewarmness in the cause of the Revolution.

M. Bignon began life in 1793 as a soldier, but after being several years in the army was transfered to the diplomatic service, in which, and in the perfomance of kindred administrative functions, he continued until the abdication of Napoleon. He is distinguished as an author and as a liberal Deputy of unimpeached attachment to constitutional principles.*

The Ministers immediately proceeded to *reform* the officers of the army and the *employés* in the civil departments, by substituting for those, who held their officers or commissions from the late government, men of their own political opinions. This was undoubtedly just and proper in

* Notwithstanding the unsparing scrutiny of the newspaper press in England and the United States, into the conduct of their respective public men, it is much easier to obtain competent knowledge of the lives and characters of public men in France than in Great Britain or America, owing to the multiplicity of cotemporary biographies published in France. The various 'Biographies des Députés' and 'Biographies des Pairs' are especially useful in giving such information.

such a change of dynasty, a political revolution brought on by the usurpation of the previous head of the State, and essential, indeed, to the stability of the new institutions. The officers of the old army now had their revenge for the neglect to which they had been doomed during the two last reigns. To have been prominent in the days of the Republic or the Empire became a title to reward, not a badge of disgrace. The victors of the Three Days did not manifest any indisposition to be recompensed for the toils and dangers and losses they had undergone during the last week of July. In the claims for official honors and emoluments, which occupied the attention of the new Ministers, those of the journalists were not the least urgent. While their fearless conduct had certainly entitled them to be well considered, yet if they were desirous thus to cancel the merit of their professedly patriotic exertions by receiving compensation as for mercenary services performed, it may well be supposed that no government, in the then state of France, would feel disposed to slight the pretensions of those who governed the movement of the newspaper press.

The next care of the new Ministers was to place themselves in amicable communication with the various powers in Europe. As to the United States there was of course no room for doubt or difficulty. Mr. Rives was among the earliest of the diplomatic agents in Paris to offer his good wishes to a government, which, beside the advantages of having plausible grounds of right to stand upon in the sense of legitimacy, had the nobler claim to respect, in the republican sense, as being the product of the sovereign will of the people. Our government entered, without hesitation, into the most cordial and friendly intercourse with that

of Louis Philippe. Nor could Great Britain fail to see that, in the recent events, France had but imitated the proceedings of the revolution, by virtue of which alone the House of Hanover ascended the throne. Whatever sympathy the Duke of Wellington had for the fate of Charles X, it was impossible for him to deny that this unhappy prince had provoked and justly incurred his misfortunes. Nor would the Duke, or any other English minister, however strained the notions he might entertain of legitimacy, have presumed to propose the quixotic plan of refusing to acknowledge Louis Philippe. England, therefore, from principle, and the Netherlands, as much from fear as principle, manifested no reluctance in renewing their amicable relations with France. — Austria, Prussia, and Spain were less prompt in doing so; but they, like some of the minor States, did not feel bold enough, either individually or collectively, to defy the revolutionary spirit, which, if duly provoked, seemed as capable now, as it was thirty years before, of sending out its armed missionaries to preach a fearful doctrine of liberty and conquest in every corner of Europe. Russia made a stand against the dangerous example of popular right taking to itself the companionship of popular might; but the domestic troubles of the Czar compelled him also to temporize, and at last to acknowledge the new government when he could no longer help doing it. France herself, with the democratic vigor of a national effort, speedily armed her population and assumed the attitude of defensive energy suited to her new position; and while professing an earnest desire to preserve peace, prepared herself to encounter the hazards of war without reluctance or apprehension.

Meanwhile, ere proceeding to narrate the events

in other parts of Europe consequent upon the Revolution of the Three Days, it is fit we should advert to the impeachment and trial of the ex-ministers of Charles X, as naturally belonging to this part of our subject. After the successful issue of the Three Days, the new government of Louis Philippe took no measures for apprehending the ex-ministers, being willing in fact that they should make their escape out of France. MM. d'Haussez, Capelle, and de Montbel contrived to avoid arrest, and took refuge in other countries; but MM. de Peyronnet, Guernon de Ranville, and Chantelauze were apprehended by the local authorities at Tours, and M. de Polignac in the same way at Granville in Normandy. Of course, the government had no remedy but to submit to the disagreeable necessity of bringing to punishment the responsible authors of the criminal Ordinances of July.

Indeed, on the 13th of August, M. Salverte, one of the members of the Chamber of Deputies for Paris, moved for and obtained the appointment of a committee, to draw up an act of impeachment against the ex-ministers for high treason. On the 29th the examinations were had of the four ex-ministers under arrest. On the 23d of September M. de Bérenger delivered a report in behalf of the committee, impeaching of high treason MM. de Polignac, de Peyronnet, Chantelauze, de Guernon Ranville, Capelle, and de Montbel, the subscribers of the Ordinances of July.

'For having abused their power, in order to falsify the elections, and to deprive the citizens of their civil rights;

'For having arbitrarily and violently changed the institutions of the kingdom, and being guilty of a conspiracy against the national safety of the State;

'For having excited civil war, and armed one class of citizens against another, and carried devastation and massacre through the capital, as well as through several of the communes.'

The report consisted, as is usual in French criminal proceedings, of an argumentative history of the offences of the accused. In the present case, it comprised a long history of the liberticide schemes of the Bourbons ever since the Restoration, from the laws of censorship in the time of Louis XVIII down to the violent attempts on the constitution in the reign of Charles X. The report was accepted on the 28th of September, and on the 29th MM. de Bérenger, Persil, and Madiez de Montjau were chosen commissioners to prosecute the impeachment before the Peers in behalf of the Chamber of Deputies. After various preliminary proceedings the Chamber of Peers appointed the trial to take place before them on the 15th of December.

Meantime, the progress of the proceedings had produced a very serious effect on the tranquillity of the country and the composition of the government. The popular voice claimed the capital punishment of the ex-ministers, as high criminals, guilty of an atrocious offence, and meriting a proportionate visitation of public justice. On the other hand, the King and his advisers, and indeed the prominent statesmen generally, were anxious to shun the repetition of those scenes of judicial bloodshed, which had dishonored the first Revolution, and yet were afraid to oppose the wishes of the people. The leading politicians hit upon a plan for attaining their object of a very singular nature. A project of law was introduced into the Chambers, for the abolition of capital punishments; and an address to the King was voted, praying him to make use of his initiat-

ive, in order to force forward the passage of the law. Louis Philippe gladly responded to this call, and thus the Nation saw the executive and legislative authorities conspiring together, as it were, to prevent the punishment of death from being inflicted in the ex-ministers in any event, thus forestalling the sentence of the Peers.

However well intended all this may have been, the effect of it was decidedly bad. The people were calling for vengeance on their late oppressors; the popular agitators knew this; and they took care to represent the proposed law as a plot to defraud the people of their rightful victims. In consequence of this, mobs, of the most dangerous description, assembled before the Palais Royal on the 17th and 18th days of October; and the National Guard, together with the troops of the line, were put in requisition to maintain the very existence of the government. The King was obliged to temporize with the passions of his subjects. M. Odillon Barrot, the Prefect of the Seine, was directed or permitted to assure the people that justice would be done, notwithstanding the 'unseasonable' agitation of the question concerning capital punishments.

This address of M. Odillon Barrot's produced a breach in the ministry; for the Chamber of Deputies took up the matter with great heat, as an attack on them; and M. Guizot, Minister of the Interior, was not less offended. On the other hand M. Dupont de l'Eure, the Keeper of the Seals, supported the Prefect, as did General La Fayette. Hereupon M. Guizot, and his friend the the Duc de Broglie, resigned their offices. A contest ensued between the *juste milieu* party, who maintained that the true policy of France was to remain quiet and consolidate her present institutions, and the *mouvement* party, who were for carry-

ing forward the principles of the Revolution into fuller devclopement. For this time, the latter party prevailed, and the ministry was reorganized on the 2nd of November, with M. Lafitte as President of the Council and Minister of Finance, Marshal Maison of Foreign Affairs, M. Montalivet of the Interior, and M. Merilhou of Public Instruction.

The trial of M. de Polignac and his associates commenced on the 15th of December, the day assigned for that purpose. In anticipation of the most extreme popular excitement on this occasion, the Luxembourg was converted into a fortress, the most imposing array of military defence being employed to protect the Court and the prisoners from the violence of the mobs of Paris. The public authorities had been justly alarmed by the disturbances of October, and had ample cause to expect a renewal of them at the present time. But all the intelligent advisers in government affairs felt the necessity of guarding against any act of lawless violence being committed on the persons of the prisoners; because it would not fail to be considered by all Europe as conclusive proof that the new monarchy was destitute of vigor, and France subject to an irresponsible mob as in the days of *sans culottes* and *Septembrisers*. In fact, conspirators and agitators of all kinds were at work in Paris, eager to rouse the elements of anarchy into a storm, and ready to take advantage of the hour of confusion.

This important trial lasted only a week from the 15th to the 21st of December inclusive. M. de Martignac, the head of that cabinet which Polignac displaced, did himself great credit by undertaking and ably conducting the defence of M. de Polignac; and each of the other ex-ministers had his counsel. The facts, on which the accu-

sation was founded, were of course abundantly proved, although considerable difference appeared in the degree of guilt of the parties, so far as regarded their disposition to violate the Charter. M. de Polignac's intentions and conduct proved to be much the worst, while MM. de Peyronnet and Chantelauze reluctantly assented to what they did not originate or approve. And it appeared after all that Charles and the Duke of Angoulême, the immediate victims of the Three Days, were the blind and deluded authors of the attack on the Charter, or at least the tools in this respect of some secret cabal behind the throne, which impelled the King and the Dauphin to act upon their Ministers with all the influence of royalty.

But what crime had the ex-ministers committed? In England, so long familiar with bills of attainder and impeachment, and having an inexhaustible store of precedents for the prosecution of treasons and misdemeanors of every degree and variety, there would have been no difficulty in the course of proceeding in this case. But in France, which had always been without any form of ministerial responsibility previous to the Revolution, it was no easy matter to find a law under which the accused could be convicted, guilty as they clearly were of the most flagrant offence against their country in levying war upon the Charter, thus overturning the monarchy itself, besides filling the capital with bloodshed. The 56th article of the Charter of 1814 provided that the ministers of the crown might be tried for treason or embezzlement, and that laws should be passed defining the offences and prescribing the punishment. But this had never been done. The commission of the Chamber of Peers, in reporting on the subject, took the ground that it was an inhe-

rent right of the government to punish individuals convicted of such offences, even although no specific law existed to that effect. The commissions for conducting the impeachment placed the prosecution on grounds a little more technical and professional. They discovered a clause in one of the ephemeral constitutions of the first Revolution, the Constitution of the year VIII as it was called, which clause they contended was yet in force, inasmuch as no provision *in pari materia* had since been enacted.

M. de Martignac's defence was extremely ingenious, elaborate, and eloquent. He maintained, among other things, that the banishment of Charles X and the disfranchisement of his family, had stripped the offence of the ex-ministers of object or legal cause. Their crime, he argued, being against a dynasty, which had ceased to rule, was not punishable under the government of Louis Philippe. The defence set up by M. Sauzet, the counsel of M. Chantelauze, was that the Bourbons came in upon France as enemies; that they and the country had been in a state of war ever since; and that the ex-ministers, belonging to the defeated party, were to be considered as prisoners of war, and of course not liable as for treason. It was easy, of course, to refute these, and all the other arguments in defence of the accused, whose crime was too clearly proved, and too flagrant in itself, to pass unpunished. They were severally convicted and sentenced to imprisonment for life, the additional penalty of civil death being imposed on M. de Polignac for his greater share of guilt. The prisoners were immediately removed to the castle of Vincennes, to protect them against the possibility of violence, when the comparative mildness of their punishment should become known in Paris.

During the whole course of the trial, the situation of Paris was perilous in the extreme, and especially so on the last two days. Vast multitudes of workmen assembled around the Odéon and in front of the Luxembourg, and filled the other great squares in the region of the Hôtel de Ville and the Tuileries. Their chief aim seemed to be to procure the death of the state prisoners, and perhaps engage in plunder if they should succeed in breaking down the public authority. — They were unarmed, but among them were seen individuals of better appearance, who seemed to instigate and abet the violence of the rabble. — Nothing but the loyalty of the National Guard preserved the government in this fearful crisis. Not less than 70,000 men were under arms on the last day of the trial; and during the whole course of it, Paris exhibited the spectacle of a city filled with hostile troops. Infantry lined the streets and squares, supported by powerful bodies of artillery and cavalry. The soldiers bivouacked in the public squares during the long winter nights, and the light of their watch fires added to the solemn gloom and anxious feelings of the time. La Fayette and the King himself spared no effort, by constant personal exertion among the soldiers and the populace, to sustain the loyalty of the former, and to check the violence of the latter. By these means, the threatened convulsions were averted, and on the 23rd, when the prisoners were no longer in Paris, the people ceased to assemble, and the capital resumed its accustomed tranquillity.

Here commences a new struggle of parties in France, a new series of events in the history of the Revolution. All Europe now stood in fearful expectation, filled with well founded dread lest the diffusion of freedom and national indepen-

dence from France to other countries should kindle up intestine commotion and foreign war from one end of Europe to the other. It is not surprising that sovereigns, whose whole rule was a series of usurpations such as that which had just hurled Charles X from his throne, and who held their authority only by the tenure of conquest, or successful oppression of their natural subjects, should begin to feel a terrible looking forward to judgment, when they heard the lesson of popular strength and popular vengeance, which the Barricades of Paris proclaimed to every subject of misrule throughout the civilized world.

They saw that France had reopened a school of liberty for the teaching of nations. La Marseillaise had again become classic verse, chanted by every voice and seemingly sacred to every heart, where but a few weeks before to lisp its name would have been sedition. The Reveil du Peüple rang once more through France, arousing her myriads like a trumpet call. The tricolored flag, which had waved in triumph over so many well fought and hard won fields of battle, was unfurled again, and flung abroad to the breeze as the standard of a martial people, full of enthusiasm and ardor, and proud to avow those forbidden tenets of national independence, which European princes would gladly keep confined to these wilds of America. What wonder that Nicholas, or Frederic William, or Francis of Austria, or William of Nassau should have trembled in the inmost recesses of their palaces? For they saw France again revolutionary, regenerate, snapping asunder the chains which had been fastened upon her at Waterloo, like Sampson escaping from the toils of Dalilah, and standing up in her strength as an armed knight ready to do battle against all challengers.

And we leave the French for the present with the form and conditions of government which their leaders had chosen for them, entering upon the agitated career of freedom under better auspices than in the old time. The whole field of political disquisition was now open to her writers and her speakers. With them, it was no longer a dispute of ordinances, or double vote, or censorships, and still less of Villèle or Polignac, those ministerial bugbears, which had so long been used to frighten men withal. These were trivial questions which had passed away forever, and yielded place to more stirring matters, as the rushing tempest clears off the mists from the lower sky. It ceased to be a consideration simply of the now comparatively trifling inquiry, of what dynasty should sit on the throne of Saint Louis. In the developement of the principle, which was become the basis of the public law of the French, that neither divine communication to a favored individual or family, nor transmission by hereditary succession, nor prescription, nor concession from the head of the church, nor consecration by his legates and bishops, was the legitimate source of power, but that it flowed only from the supreme will of the People; — and in the consideration whether the defence of their own institutions did not require them to anticipate the formation of a hostile league of crowned heads, and to propagate the faith of liberty as it were *in partibus infidelium*, so as to raise up beforehand an adversary league of the governed millions for their reciprocal protection against the governing few; — in such deep and all comprehensive subjects of interest was the ripe mind of France now absorbed, to the exclusion of every meaner thing. To the French there had commenced a period of daring speculation, of bold purpose, of brilliant promise: to all but the French,

a period of vehement agitation and uncontrolable solicitude. The meteor star of revolution had arisen to pour forth its stormy light upon the nations: but what presumptuous gazer could presume to calculate its orbit?

END OF REVIEW.